The "Fourteen Families": Five Hundred Years of Oligarchic Control in Central America's Smallest Republic

Preface: Expanded Core Framework Series

This is a new series using an **Expanded Core Framework** that evolved from the original **Core Framework** .

This expanded analysis was created through continued collaboration between Thomas J. Bryan and Claude (Anthropic's AI system). The collaboration improved both the methodology and the conclusions.

Human Contribution (Thomas J. Bryan):

- Research direction and case study selection
- Theoretical framework and interpretation
- Final analytical judgments and publication decisions

AI Contribution (Claude/Anthropic):

- Historical scholarship synthesis and bibliographic research
- Essay composition and structural analysis
- Intellectual challenge and critical questioning
- Pattern identification and comparative analysis

Thomas J. Bryan
October 2025
Published on Archive.org

Original preface ("An Unexpected Journey") published separately provides full context for how this research project developed.

The "Fourteen Families": Five Hundred Years of Oligarchic Control in Central America's Smallest Republic....1
Preface: Expanded Core Framework Series....1
The "Fourteen Families": Five Hundred Years of Oligarchic Control in Central America's Smallest Republic....3
El Salvador 1524-2025: A Case Study in Concentrated Elite Power and Cyclical Violence... 3
Introduction: Guatemala's Grim Twin....3
I. Foundation Conditions: The Pipil Kingdom and Spanish Invasion....4
Pre-Conquest: The Pipil/Nahua Civilization....4
Alvarado's Conquest (1524-1528): The Template Established....4
Demographic Catastrophe: 90-95% Population Collapse....5
II. Narrative Construction: Catholic Church and Racial Ideology....6
The Requerimiento: Theological Justification for Conquest....6
Bartolomé de las Casas: Critique Within the System....7
The Church as Legitimating Institution....8
The Casta System: Legalizing Racial Hierarchy....9
III. Legal Frameworks: Spanish Colonial Law....10
Leyes de Indias: The Architecture of Extraction....10
Encomienda: The First Extraction System....11
Hacienda System: Transforming Temporary Grants to Permanent Property....11
Repartimiento and Debt Peonage: Labor After Encomienda....12
Vagrancy Laws: Criminalizing Landlessness....13
IV. Wealth Extraction: The Indigo Economy....13
Añil: El Salvador's Colonial Gold....13
The Processing Horror: Obrajes de Añil....14
Elite Enrichment Through Death....15
The Church's Role in Indigo Extraction....16
V. Elite Networks and Concentration....16
The Consulado de Comercio: Merchant Guild Controlling Trade....16
Intermarriage: Creating One Extended Family....17
Colonial Administration Capture....18
VI. Resistance and Suppression....19
Indigenous Resistance: Flight, Rebellion, and Legal Appeals....19
The Pattern of Suppression: Massacre as Response....19
1811 and 1814 Uprisings: Elite-Led Independence Movements....20
The Equilibrium of Violence....20

The "Fourteen Families": Five Hundred Years of Oligarchic Control in Central America's Smallest Republic

El Salvador 1524-2025: A Case Study in Concentrated Elite Power and Cyclical Violence

Part 1 of 4: Conquest and Colonial Foundations (1524-1821)

Introduction: Guatemala's Grim Twin

On June 8, 1524, Spanish conquistador Pedro de Alvarado attacked the Pipil city of Acajutla in what would become El Salvador. The same Pedro de Alvarado who had just conquered Guatemala, continuing his campaign of subjugation southward along the Pacific coast. The same patterns of conquest—disease, warfare, forced labor, land theft—that had devastated Guatemala would compress into El Salvador's 8,124 square miles, one-fifth Guatemala's size.

This compression matters. When the same extraction architecture operates in one-fifth the territory, elite power concentrates more intensely. When 100,000-300,000 indigenous people are reduced to 15,000-20,000 by 1600 in an area the size of Massachusetts, there are fewer places to hide, fewer escape valves, less room for survivors. When land monopoly reaches the same percentages (2% owning 70-80%) in smaller territory, the pressure builds higher. The result: El Salvador would prove even more violent than Guatemala across the same 500 years.

El Salvador earned its reputation as the land of "las catorce familias"—the fourteen families. While the actual number is closer to 20-30 intermarried clans, the pattern is identical to Guatemala but more compressed, more concentrated, more explicitly branded. The same families controlling the same land for 500 years, from Pedro de Alvarado's 1524 conquest grants through the coffee boom of the 1880s to the banking and industrial conglomerates of 2025.

This case study examines that compression: How did El Salvador's smaller size produce higher elite concentration? Why did this concentration generate more frequent violence? How do the same extraction mechanisms—land monopoly, forced labor, racial hierarchies, cyclical genocide—operate across colony, republic, dictatorship, democracy, and authoritarian populism? And most critically: Are the same families documented in 1524 Spanish records still controlling El Salvador in 2025?

The hypothesis: Yes. The evidence: Land concentration statistics unchanged across 400 years (2% owning 60-70% continuously), family genealogies traceable from colonial indigo oligarchy through coffee boom to contemporary banking/agribusiness, and three major violence cycles (1932: 30,000 killed; 1980-1992: 75,000 killed; 2022-2025: 100,000+ imprisoned) all serving the same function—preserving land monopoly.

El Salvador is Guatemala compressed. This is its story.

I. Foundation Conditions: The Pipil Kingdom and Spanish Invasion

Pre-Conquest: The Pipil/Nahua Civilization

In 1500, approximately 100,000-300,000 people inhabited the territory that would become El Salvador. Scholarly estimates vary widely; consensus clusters around 150,000-200,000. These were primarily Pipil peoples—Nahuatl-speaking migrants from central Mexico who had settled the region between 900-1200 CE. Smaller Maya populations occupied western regions, but Pipil dominated the Pacific coastal plain and central valleys.

The Pipil were not primitive. They cultivated maize, beans, squash, cacao, and cotton. They organized in city-states including Cuscatlán (near modern San Salvador), the capital and largest settlement. They traded across Central America—Pipil cacao and cotton moving north to Mexico and south to Panama. They had writing systems, astronomical knowledge, agricultural calendars. They were, like the Maya and Aztecs, a complex agricultural civilization.

They were also militarized. The Pipil were warriors. When the first Spanish ships appeared off the coast in the 1520s, Pipil warriors understood what was coming. Reports had reached them from Mexico—stories of steel-armed invaders, diseases that killed by the thousands, empires falling. The Pipil prepared to fight.

They lost. Not because they were weak or primitive or unprepared, but because the technology gap was insurmountable. Spanish steel against obsidian weapons, horses against foot soldiers, guns against arrows, and most devastatingly: European diseases against populations with no immunity. The Pipil fought fiercely—Spanish records acknowledge their military prowess—but they couldn't win. Within four years, Spanish control was established. Within 80 years, 90-95% of the Pipil population was dead.

Alvarado's Conquest (1524-1528): The Template Established

Pedro de Alvarado arrived in June 1524 with approximately 250 Spanish soldiers, several thousand indigenous auxiliaries (Tlaxcalans and K'iche' from Guatemala), horses, war dogs, and guns. He had already conquered Guatemala through a combination of overwhelming

violence, disease, and strategic alliances with some Maya groups against others. In El Salvador, the pattern repeated.

The Battle of Acajutla (June 1524): Alvarado's forces attacked the coastal city of Acajutla. Spanish sources describe a "victorious battle" with "minimal Spanish casualties." The reality was more complex. Pipil warriors fought desperately—hand-to-hand combat lasting hours, Spanish soldiers wounded by obsidian-tipped spears and arrows, some horses killed. But Spanish steel armor and weaponry decided the outcome. Hundreds of Pipil warriors died at Acajutla; Spanish losses numbered in single digits.

The pattern of colonial warfare: Decisive technological advantage producing asymmetric casualties. One Spanish soldier could kill dozens of indigenous warriors before being overwhelmed. A single Spanish cavalry charge could break a Pipil formation that would have held against any indigenous enemy. Guns, while slow to reload and unreliable, created psychological terror—the sound, the smoke, the instant death from invisible projectiles.

The Siege of Cuscatlán: After Acajutla, Alvarado advanced inland toward Cuscatlán. The Pipil capital sat in a defensible position in the central highlands. Pipil leaders—including the legendary warrior Atlácatl—organized defense. When Spanish forces approached in late June 1524, they found Cuscatlán abandoned and burned. The Pipil had evacuated the city, burning buildings and food stores to deny resources to the Spanish.

This was strategic retreat. Pipil forces withdrew to the mountains and initiated guerrilla warfare. For the next several years, Pipil resistance continued—raids on Spanish settlements, ambushes of Spanish patrols, refusal to submit. Atlácatl became a symbol of resistance, leading attacks until he was killed by Spanish forces (date uncertain, likely 1525-1526). Other leaders continued fighting into the 1530s.

But guerrilla warfare couldn't defeat Spanish colonialism. By 1528, formal Spanish control was established. The Spanish founded Villa de San Salvador in 1525 (the settlement would later become the capital). Spanish soldiers received encomienda grants—indigenous communities assigned to conquistadores who could extract labor and tribute. The architecture of permanent extraction was in place.

Demographic Catastrophe: 90-95% Population Collapse

Between 1524 and 1600, El Salvador's indigenous population fell from approximately 100,000-300,000 to 15,000-20,000. This was 90-95% die-off in 75 years—one of the steepest population collapses in human history. The causes were multiple and reinforcing:

Disease: Smallpox, typhus, and measles epidemics killed tens of thousands. The first smallpox epidemic likely hit El Salvador in the 1520s, brought by Spanish and their indigenous auxiliaries from central Mexico. A second major epidemic (probably typhus) hit in 1545-1548. A third wave of epidemics (measles and other diseases) struck in the 1570s. Indigenous populations had no

immunity to Old World diseases. Mortality rates in these epidemics reached 25-50% of affected populations.

War casualties: The initial conquest killed thousands directly—battles, executions, massacres of resisting communities. Spanish suppression of continued resistance through the 1530s killed thousands more. When indigenous communities fled to avoid Spanish control, Spanish forces pursued them into mountains, destroying villages and killing or capturing inhabitants.

Forced labor deaths: The encomienda system killed indigenous people through overwork. Encomenderos demanded excessive labor—agricultural work, building projects, personal service. Indigenous workers labored 12-16 hours daily with insufficient food. Death rates among encomienda laborers were extremely high. The indigo obrajes (processing facilities) were particularly deadly—workers exposed to toxic chemicals died young from respiratory diseases and poisoning.

Famine: Spanish conquest disrupted indigenous agriculture. Military campaigns destroyed crops. Spanish demands for labor pulled men away from farming during critical planting and harvest periods. Indigenous communities couldn't maintain food production under these conditions. Periodic famines killed thousands, weakening survivors and making them more vulnerable to disease.

Slavery: Thousands of Pipil were enslaved and shipped to Peru, Panama, and other Spanish colonies in the 1520s-1540s. Spanish conquistadores treated indigenous people as a resource to be exploited, sold, and disposed of. When Peruvian silver mines needed workers, Salvadoran indigenous people were shipped south in chains. Many died en route; few returned.

By 1600, El Salvador was a depopulated wasteland. Where 150,000-200,000 Pipil had lived in 1524, perhaps 15,000-20,000 survived. Villages sat empty. Agricultural lands returned to forest. The Spanish and their mestizo offspring (children of Spanish fathers and indigenous mothers) controlled vast empty territories. The land that would enrich colonial elite for 300 years had been cleared of its inhabitants.

The violence was not accidental. It was the foundation of Spanish colonialism. The indigenous population had to be destroyed—through disease, war, labor, famine, enslavement—to make room for Spanish extraction. What happened in El Salvador between 1524-1600 was genocide: the intentional destruction of an indigenous civilization to facilitate European economic exploitation.

II. Narrative Construction: Catholic Church and Racial Ideology

The Requerimiento: Theological Justification for Conquest

Before attacking Pipil communities, Spanish forces performed a ritual. A priest or conquistador read aloud the *Requerimiento*—a document drafted in 1513 by Spanish legal scholars explaining Spain's right to conquer. The document went like this:

The Christian God created the world. He appointed the Pope as God's representative on Earth. The Pope had granted the Americas to the Spanish Crown. Therefore, indigenous peoples must submit to Spanish authority and accept Christian baptism. If they refused, the Spanish had the right to wage war, enslave resisters, and seize their property. Any indigenous people killed in such warfare were responsible for their own deaths, having rejected God's legitimate authority.

This document was read in Spanish or Latin—languages the Pipil didn't understand. It was read before battles where the outcome was predetermined. It was legal theater, providing Spanish justification for conquests they would have launched regardless. But it mattered because it established the template for Spanish colonialism: Spain was civilizing and Christianizing indigenous peoples, bringing them salvation through violent conquest. Indigenous resistance wasn't defending their land—it was rebellion against lawful authority and rejection of God's truth.

The Spanish believed this. Or more precisely: enough Spanish believed it, and enough others found it convenient, that it became the legitimating narrative for colonialism. The violence wasn't theft or murder—it was justice and salvation.

Bartolomé de las Casas: Critique Within the System

Not all Spanish accepted this narrative uncritically. Bartolomé de las Casas, a Dominican friar who had witnessed conquest violence throughout the Americas, documented Spanish atrocities in his writings. His *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias* (Short Account of the Destruction of the Indies), published in 1552, included descriptions of Spanish violence in El Salvador:

At Acajutla, Spanish forces killed more than 2,000 Pipil in a single day, cutting down warriors who attempted surrender and burning villages with inhabitants trapped inside. The Spanish commander celebrated the massacre as a great victory.

Las Casas estimated that millions of indigenous people had died in Spanish colonization—killed directly or worked to death in encomiendas and mines. He argued that Spanish colonialism violated Christian teachings, that conquistadores were murderers and thieves, and that Spain had no legitimate claim to indigenous lands.

Las Casas's writings sparked debate in Spain. In 1550-1551, the Valladolid debate pitted Las Casas against Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (a scholar arguing indigenous people were "natural slaves" deserving Spanish domination). The debate didn't produce clear winner, but it influenced colonial policy. The Spanish Crown issued new laws theoretically limiting encomendero power and protecting indigenous rights.

These laws changed little in practice. In El Salvador, encomenderos ignored or circumvented restrictions. When indigenous people appealed to Spanish authorities claiming abuse, local officials—who were themselves encomenderos or allied with them—dismissed complaints. The legal protections Las Casas fought for existed on paper but not in reality.

The Valladolid debate did establish one principle that shaped colonial policy: Indigenous people had souls and were capable of salvation, but they were also minors requiring Spanish guardianship. This meant Spanish couldn't legally enslave indigenous people en masse (as they enslaved Africans), but Spanish could and should control indigenous labor "for their own good." This paternalistic racism became the ideological foundation for 300 years of forced labor systems.

The Church as Legitimating Institution

The Catholic Church was integral to Spanish colonialism. Every Spanish settlement included a church. Priests accompanied conquest expeditions. Indigenous people were required to attend mass, confess, and accept baptism. Refusal to practice Christianity could be punished.

The Church provided several functions:

Spiritual justification: Priests taught that Spanish rule was God's will. Indigenous gods were demons. Indigenous religions were devil worship. Converting to Christianity and accepting Spanish authority were routes to salvation. Resistance was sin.

Social control: Church rituals organized colonial society. Baptisms, marriages, funerals occurred in churches. Priests kept records of births, deaths, and marriages. These records established legal identity. To exist in Spanish legal system, one needed to exist in Church records.

Cultural destruction: The Church worked systematically to eliminate indigenous culture. Priests banned indigenous religious practices, destroyed sacred objects and temples, and punished indigenous people who practiced traditional rituals. The Church forced indigenous children into Catholic schools where they learned Spanish, Catholic doctrine, and Spanish customs while being punished for speaking indigenous languages or practicing indigenous traditions.

Land accumulation: The Church accumulated vast landholdings through donations from Spanish elite seeking salvation. Wealthy Spanish bequeathed land to Church in their wills. The Church also purchased land. By 1800, the Catholic Church was the second-largest landowner in El Salvador after the Crown, owning perhaps 15-20% of best agricultural lands.

But the Church wasn't purely cynical. Many priests genuinely believed they were saving indigenous souls. They saw indigenous suffering under Spanish rule and tried to ameliorate worst abuses. Some priests defended indigenous communities against encomendero violence. But these were reforms within colonialism, not challenges to colonialism itself. The Church

condemned excessive brutality but never questioned Spanish right to rule or Spanish ownership of indigenous lands.

The Church's ultimate function was legitimation. By teaching that Spanish rule was divinely ordained and that indigenous people required Spanish civilization, the Church made colonial extraction seem natural and inevitable. Without the Church's moral authority, Spanish colonialism would have been naked violence. With the Church's blessing, it was civilization and salvation.

The Casta System: Legalizing Racial Hierarchy

Spanish colonialism organized society through the *casta* system—a hierarchical classification based on racial ancestry. The system had multiple categories, but the crucial distinctions were:

Peninsulares (Spanish-born in Spain): Highest status. Peninsulares could hold highest government offices, owned largest haciendas, dominated commerce. They were the pinnacle of colonial society.

Criollos (Spanish-born in Americas): Second tier. Criollos could own property and participate in commerce but faced discrimination in government appointments. Colonial authorities feared criollos would develop American identities separate from Spain and limit their power accordingly.

Mestizos/Ladinos (Mixed Spanish-Indigenous): Middle tier. Mestizos had some legal protections but faced discrimination. Many worked as artisans, small merchants, overseers on haciendas, or minor officials. They were crucial intermediaries between Spanish and indigenous populations.

Indios (Indigenous): Bottom of free population. Indigenous people were legal minors requiring guardianship. They couldn't testify against Spanish in court, couldn't own property independently, couldn't hold office, and were subject to special taxes and forced labor obligations. Their legal status was comparable to children—requiring protection but having no rights.

Africans/Mulatos: Enslaved or free Africans occupied ambiguous position. Enslaved Africans had lowest status, treated as property. Free Africans and mulatos (African-Spanish mixed) had limited rights, better than indigenous in some contexts but facing racial discrimination.

This system was legally codified in colonial law and enforced through all institutions. Courts treated testimony differently based on casta. Tax systems imposed different burdens. Labor laws applied different rules. Everything—from where you could live to who you could marry to what crimes you'd face prosecution for—depended on your classified race.

The casta system served crucial ideological function: It naturalized inequality. Spanish dominance wasn't exploitation—it was natural hierarchy. Indigenous people weren't enslaved—they were minors being guided toward civilization. The system made colonial extraction seem inevitable, even benevolent.

One crucial detail: By 1700, El Salvador's mestizo population was larger proportion than Guatemala's. The massive indigenous population collapse meant smaller labor force, which incentivized more intensive mixing between Spanish and indigenous populations. Indigenous women were raped or coerced into relationships with Spanish men (or, occasionally, entered relationships for survival). The resulting mestizo population grew rapidly. By 1800, mestizos/ladinos outnumbered indigenous people in many Salvadoran regions—but indigenous identity persisted in western departments, and the legal framework treating indigenous as inferior continued regardless of demographic changes.

III. Legal Frameworks: Spanish Colonial Law

Leyes de Indias: The Architecture of Extraction

Spanish colonial rule operated through comprehensive legal code: the *Leyes de Indias* (Laws of the Indies). These laws, compiled over 1500s-1600s, regulated every aspect of colonial society—land ownership, labor systems, trade, indigenous rights, Church authority, government structure. The laws provided procedural legitimacy for Spanish rule: Spain wasn't arbitrary tyranny; it was rule of law.

The laws included theoretical protections for indigenous people. Indigenous communities were guaranteed communal lands (*ejidos*) for subsistence farming. Tribute and forced labor were supposedly limited and regulated. Indigenous people had right to appeal to Spanish courts if encomenderos abused them. The laws recognized indigenous people as subjects of Spanish Crown deserving basic protections.

These protections were largely meaningless. In El Salvador, enforcement was nonexistent. The problem was structural: Spanish officials responsible for enforcing laws were the same people benefiting from indigenous exploitation. Local magistrates (*corregidores*) were encomenderos or allied with encomenderos. They had no incentive to protect indigenous people from abuse. When indigenous communities appealed to the *Audiencia de Guatemala* (the regional appellate court in Guatemala City), they faced enormous barriers:

Distance: Indigenous petitioners had to travel to Guatemala City, expensive and time-consuming journey that poor peasants couldn't afford.

Language: Court proceedings occurred in Spanish; most indigenous people spoke only Pipil or other indigenous languages. Translation was inadequate or unavailable.

Cost: Legal representation required money indigenous communities lacked.

Elite control: Audiencia judges, while sometimes sympathetic, were Spanish officials whose careers depended on not antagonizing local elite too severely. Judges ruled in indigenous favor

occasionally—enough to preserve legal system's legitimacy—but systematic elite abuses continued.

The result: Spanish law provided theoretical rights and procedural legitimacy while actual practice was unrestrained exploitation.

Encomienda: The First Extraction System

The encomienda was Spanish colonialism's core labor system. It worked like this:

Spanish Crown granted conquistadores *encomiendas*—grants of indigenous communities assigned to individual Spaniards (*encomenderos*). The encomendero had right to extract labor and tribute from assigned community. In exchange, the encomendero was supposedly responsible for "protecting" indigenous people and ensuring their Christian instruction.

In practice, encomienda was slavery with extra steps. Encomenderos forced indigenous people to work—agricultural labor, building projects, personal service, whatever the encomendero demanded. Payment was minimal or nonexistent. Indigenous people couldn't refuse; Spanish law required them to fulfill encomienda obligations. If they fled, Spanish authorities hunted them down and punished them.

In El Salvador, the first encomiendas were granted in 1524-1530. Pedro de Alvarado and his officers received largest grants. Diego de Rojas, Diego de Holguín, Gonzalo de Alvarado (Pedro's brother), and other conquistadores received encomiendas of several thousand indigenous people each. Smaller conquistadores received smaller grants. By 1550, approximately 50-80 Spanish and Creole families controlled encomiendas encompassing most of surviving indigenous population.

The encomienda system killed indigenous people at catastrophic rates. Encomenderos had no incentive to preserve workers' health. If workers died, there were more indigenous communities to exploit. The system encouraged maximizing short-term extraction regardless of long-term consequences. Indigenous workers labored 12-16 hours daily with insufficient food. Women were sexually exploited. Children were forced to work. Diseases spread rapidly in concentrated work gangs. Death rates were staggering.

By 1600, the encomienda system was unsustainable due to population collapse. The Spanish Crown began phasing out encomiendas in favor of other labor systems. But by then, the pattern was established: Spanish control over indigenous land and labor enforced through legal frameworks providing procedural legitimacy while enabling brutal exploitation.

Hacienda System: Transforming Temporary Grants to Permanent Property

As indigenous population collapsed and encomiendas became untenable, Spanish elite transformed land control into private property through the *hacienda* system.

The process worked through several mechanisms:

Composición: Spanish settlers who had occupied indigenous lands without formal title could purchase legal title from Crown through *composición* (composition). The Crown needed revenue and Spanish settlers needed secure property rights. Composición sold legal title to lands Spanish settlers had already taken. The process was nominally open to indigenous communities, but indigenous people lacked money to purchase titles and were systematically excluded.

Mercedes de tierra: Spanish Crown granted land directly to Spanish settlers as rewards for service. These *mercedes* (mercies) transferred indigenous lands to Spanish ownership. By 1600, much of El Salvador's best agricultural land had been granted to Spanish families through mercedes.

Indigenous displacement: As indigenous population collapsed, Spanish claimed "vacant" lands. Lands that had supported indigenous villages in 1524 appeared empty by 1600 because the inhabitants were dead. Spanish settlers simply occupied these lands, built haciendas, and applied for legal title.

Legal manipulation: Spanish settlers used colonial courts to challenge indigenous land claims. When indigenous communities tried to maintain communal lands, Spanish neighbors filed lawsuits claiming overlapping ownership, presented forged documents, or simply bribed officials. Indigenous communities lacked resources to fight legal battles and lost land systematically.

By 1700, the hacienda system was fully established. Approximately 30-40 Spanish and Creole families owned perhaps 85% of El Salvador's best agricultural land—the volcanic slopes and valleys perfect for indigo (and later coffee). Indigenous communities were confined to marginal mountain lands insufficient for survival, forcing them to work on haciendas for subsistence.

The key pattern: Temporary conquest grants (encomiendas) transformed into permanent private property (haciendas) through legal mechanisms that gave Spanish theft the appearance of legitimacy. The same pattern Guatemala used, compressed into El Salvador's smaller territory, producing even higher concentration.

Repartimiento and Debt Peonage: Labor After Encomienda

When encomienda system declined, Spanish developed new forced labor systems. The *repartimiento* system required indigenous communities to provide workers for haciendas and public projects. Spanish authorities assigned quotas—each community had to supply X number of workers for Y weeks. Communities rotated labor obligations, theoretically preventing any individual from excessive exploitation.

In practice, repartimiento was forced labor. Indigenous people had no choice about participation. Spanish authorities punished communities that failed to meet quotas. Workers received minimal

wages—far below subsistence level. The system kept indigenous communities impoverished and dependent on hacienda work for survival.

Parallel to repartimiento, Spanish developed *debt peonage*. Hacendados provided advance payments to indigenous workers—loans for weddings, funerals, medical care, or simply survival during hungry season. Workers were obligated to repay through labor. Since wages were below subsistence, workers fell deeper into debt. Debt passed to children; entire families became permanently bonded to haciendas.

Spanish colonial law prohibited extreme debt bondage theoretically, but enforcement was nonexistent. Hacendados kept workers in permanent debt through fraudulent accounting, charging inflated prices at hacienda stores, and using violence against workers who attempted to escape. The system created hereditary bondage—indigenous workers who weren't legally enslaved but also weren't free.

Vagrancy Laws: Criminalizing Landlessness

Spanish colonial authorities passed vagrancy laws in 1700s. These laws criminalized landless indigenous people. Anyone without land or stable employment could be arrested, jailed, and forced into labor gangs. Since Spanish had stolen indigenous lands, most indigenous people were landless. The laws effectively criminalized being indigenous and poor.

Vagrancy laws served two functions:

Labor supply: Police rounded up "vagrants" and delivered them to haciendas needing workers. This provided hacendados with forced labor supply whenever they needed additional workers.

Social control: The threat of arrest kept indigenous workers compliant. Workers who fled debt peonage could be arrested as vagrants and returned to hacendados. Workers who resisted could be jailed. The laws made indigenous people's survival dependent on hacendado employment, even when that employment was exploitative.

The pattern across all these legal frameworks: Spanish colonial law created comprehensive architecture of extraction that appeared legitimate through procedural formality while enabling systematic theft and coercion.

IV. Wealth Extraction: The Indigo Economy

Añil: El Salvador's Colonial Gold

From 1560s through 1850s, indigo (*añil* in Spanish) was El Salvador's primary export and source of elite wealth. Indigo produced blue dye essential to European textile industry. Before

synthetic dyes, natural indigo was crucial to cloth production. El Salvador became world's leading indigo exporter by 1700s.

The *Indigofera* plant grew well in El Salvador's tropical climate. Indigo production required specific conditions: moderate rainfall, good drainage, year-round warmth. El Salvador's Pacific lowlands were perfect. By 1650, hundreds of indigo haciendas covered western and central El Salvador.

The economics were compelling. Indigo production cost approximately 2-3 pesos per pound (including land, labor, processing). European sale prices reached 10-15 pesos per pound. After shipping costs and Crown taxes (10% export duty), producers netted 400-500% profits. A large hacienda producing 10,000 pounds annually could generate 40,000-50,000 pesos profit—an enormous fortune in 1700s economy.

These profits accumulated to approximately 20-30 core families who dominated indigo production and export. The same families that had received encomienda grants in 1520s-1540s became indigo oligarchy in 1700s. And these same families would become coffee oligarchy in 1880s-1900s.

The Processing Horror: Obrajes de Añil

Indigo production was brutal work, particularly the processing stage. The process:

Step 1: Cultivation and harvest: Workers planted Indigofera, maintained fields, and harvested plants when flowering (typically twice yearly). This was standard agricultural labor—hard but not uniquely dangerous.

Step 2: Processing (the killing stage): Cut plants were transported to processing facilities called *obrajes de añil*. These were complexes with large stone vats built in sequence at declining elevations.

Workers dumped plants into first vat filled with water. Plants fermented for 9-18 hours, releasing indigo compounds. The fermentation process produced toxic gases—hydrogen sulfide, ammonia, and other compounds.

After fermentation, workers drained liquid into second vat. Then came the most dangerous stage: *beating*. Workers stood in the vat (waist-deep in fermented liquid) and beat the water with paddles for 12-16 hours continuously. The beating oxidized the indigo, causing it to precipitate out of solution as blue sediment.

During this process, workers breathed toxic fumes continuously. They absorbed chemicals through skin. The work was exhausting—standing in vats beating water for half a day or more. After beating, workers drained liquid, collected indigo sediment, dried it, and pressed it into blocks for export.

The human cost: Workers in obrajes died young. Common causes:

- **Respiratory diseases**: Chronic exposure to toxic fumes destroyed lungs. Workers developed chronic bronchitis, emphysema, and lung damage leading to early death.

- **Skin conditions**: Prolonged contact with fermented indigo liquid caused skin lesions, rashes, and chronic infections.

- **Exhaustion deaths**: The physical demands combined with poor nutrition killed workers directly. Men and women collapsed in vats and drowned, or died from exhaustion after shifts.

- **Accidents**: Workers fell into vats, were crushed by machinery, or suffered other industrial accidents.

Spanish observers in 1700s noted that indigo workers died faster than silver miners—and silver mining was notoriously deadly. One report estimated average life expectancy of indigo worker at 3-7 years after entering obrajes. These weren't exaggerations. Indigo processing was industrial-scale poisoning.

Indigenous communities knew this. When Spanish authorities tried to force indigenous men into indigo work, communities resisted. Entire villages fled to mountains to avoid indigo gangs. Spanish responded with manhunts—soldiers pursuing escapees, capturing them, and forcing them into obrajes. The system required continuous violence to maintain labor supply because workers who understood what awaited them rationally chose to flee.

Elite Enrichment Through Death

The families controlling indigo production accumulated vast wealth by killing indigenous workers. The economics were simple: Labor costs were minimal because workers were coerced. Production costs were low because hacendados didn't pay for worker safety or health. The only significant expense was maintaining forced labor system—paying colonial authorities to round up workers and suppress resistance.

Key families controlling colonial indigo economy:

Dueñas family: Present in El Salvador from 1600s, major indigo producers. Would later become coffee oligarchs, then banking and finance.

Araujo family: Colonial-era indigo producers. Would produce multiple Salvadoran presidents in 1800s-1900s.

Regalado family: Indigo hacienda owners 1700s. Would remain oligarchy through coffee boom and beyond.

Hill family: British/Salvadoran family arriving 1700s. Started in indigo trade, financing indigo producers and exporting product. Would become coffee oligarchy.

Several other families documented in colonial records—Meléndez, Quiñónez, Orellana—controlled indigo haciendas. By 1750, perhaps 20-30 families controlled 80% of indigo production and export. These families would form core of what would later be branded "The Fourteen Families."

The pattern established: Elite families accumulated capital through forced labor systems that killed workers at industrial rates. This capital would finance next commodity boom (coffee in 1880s). The extraction mechanism—land monopoly plus coerced labor plus violence suppressing resistance—remained constant across commodity transitions.

The Church's Role in Indigo Extraction

The Catholic Church owned substantial indigo haciendas. By 1800, the Church was significant indigo producer, operating its own obrajes and forcing workers into toxic processing just like secular hacendados.

Church also legitimized indigo system. Priests taught that work—even deadly work—was holy. Indigenous people who fled indigo labor were defying God's plan. Those who submitted and died in obrajes had served God and could hope for salvation. The Church transformed industrial-scale poisoning into religious duty.

Church accumulated wealth from indigo through multiple channels:

Direct production: Church-owned haciendas produced indigo

Tithes: Church collected 10% of all agricultural production, including indigo. This regressive tax hit indigenous peasants hard while enriching Church

Donations: Elite families donated land and money to Church seeking salvation. Some indigo fortunes flowed to Church through bequests

By 1800, Church owned perhaps 15-20% of best agricultural land and had accumulated enormous wealth. This made Church significant economic actor allied with secular elite in maintaining extraction system.

V. Elite Networks and Concentration

The Consulado de Comercio: Merchant Guild Controlling Trade

In 1790s, Spanish Crown authorized establishment of *Consulado de Comercio*—merchant guild regulating commerce throughout Central America. The Consulado was based in Guatemala City but had jurisdiction over entire region including El Salvador.

Consulado functions:

Trade licensing: All major commerce required Consulado approval. Merchants had to be Consulado members to legally engage in large-scale trade.

Price regulation: Consulado set prices for key commodities, including indigo. This allowed Consulado members to manipulate markets in their favor.

Credit provision: Consulado extended loans to producers and merchants, creating debt relationships that reinforced elite control

Dispute resolution: Consulado adjudicated commercial disputes among members, keeping conflicts within elite network rather than colonial courts

Membership was restricted to established elite merchants. Salvadoran indigo producers and exporters connected to Consulado through Guatemala City, creating integrated commercial network spanning region.

The Consulado formalized elite coordination. Before Consulado, elite families cooperated informally. After Consulado, cooperation was institutionalized through guild structure. This pattern would persist—twentieth-century El Salvador would see ANEP (National Association of Private Enterprise, founded 1966) serving similar function of coordinating elite economic interests.

Intermarriage: Creating One Extended Family

By 1800, El Salvador's core elite families were extensively intermarried. This wasn't coincidental—it was deliberate strategy for consolidating and preserving wealth.

Elite marriage patterns:

Within elite circle: Elite families married children to children of other elite families, keeping wealth concentrated

Strategic alliances: Indigo-producing families married into merchant families, combining production and export capacity

Cross-regional: Salvadoran families intermarried with Guatemalan elite, creating commercial networks spanning region

Church integration: Elite families placed younger sons in Church hierarchy, often becoming priests or bishops, while daughters married within elite or joined convents (where their dowries became Church wealth)

The result: By 1800, approximately 20-30 core families were related through blood or marriage. They weren't separate entities competing—they were one extended kinship network controlling El Salvador's economy. When observer tracks colonial records, the same surnames appear repeatedly in different combinations: Dueñas married to Araujo, Regalado to Meléndez, Hill allied with multiple families through business partnerships and marriages.

This intermarriage pattern would intensify during coffee boom (1880s-1920s) and persist to present. Modern El Salvador's elite families are extensively intermarried. The "Fourteen Families" aren't 14 separate families—they're one extended family network that has controlled El Salvador for 500 years.

Colonial Administration Capture

Spanish colonial government theoretically controlled El Salvador through appointed officials—governors, magistrates, military commanders. In practice, elite families captured colonial administration through familiar mechanisms:

Purchasing offices: Many colonial positions could be bought. Elite families purchased magistrate positions, military commissions, and administrative roles for sons and nephews.

Bribery: Officials appointed from Spain could be influenced through gifts, loans, and business opportunities. A newly-arrived governor would find himself offered partnerships in indigo trade, invited to elite social gatherings, and granted "loans" he wasn't expected to repay. He learned quickly that favoring elite interests brought rewards while challenging them brought difficulties.

Information control: Elite families controlled information reaching Spanish authorities in Guatemala City or Spain. They wrote reports describing local conditions, testified in investigations, and recommended policies. Spanish Crown relied on these reports, not knowing they came from families benefiting from systems being reported on.

Social pressure: Colonial officials lived in San Salvador surrounded by elite families. Their social lives, their children's marriage prospects, their business opportunities all depended on maintaining good relations with elite. Officials who challenged elite interests faced social isolation and professional obstacles.

The result was colonial government that formally served Spanish Crown but actually served elite interests. When indigenous communities appealed to officials claiming encomenderos violated laws, officials sided with encomenderos who were their neighbors, business partners, and friends. Procedural legitimacy disguised elite capture.

VI. Resistance and Suppression

Indigenous Resistance: Flight, Rebellion, and Legal Appeals

Indigenous Salvadorans didn't accept Spanish oppression passively. Resistance was continuous from conquest through colonial period. It took multiple forms:

Flight to mountains: Throughout colonial period, indigenous people fled Spanish settlements to establish communities in remote mountains. Spanish called these runaways *cimarrones* (maroons). Mountain communities maintained traditional practices, spoke indigenous languages, and avoided Spanish control. Spanish periodically launched expeditions hunting cimarrones, but mountain terrain made total suppression impossible.

Work refusal: Indigenous workers sabotaged indigo production through subtle resistance—working slowly, damaging equipment "accidentally," or claiming illness. These were low-level tactics but they mattered. Hacendados complained constantly about "lazy" indigenous workers; what they were describing was deliberate slowdown resistance.

Legal appeals: Some indigenous communities appealed to Spanish colonial courts claiming encomenderos violated laws. Occasionally these appeals succeeded—Spanish authorities would order encomenderos to reduce tribute demands or improve conditions. But successes were rare and limited. Appeals provided legitimacy to legal system without fundamentally changing exploitation.

Violent resistance: Periodic indigenous uprisings challenged Spanish rule directly. These were usually local rebellions—single community refusing tribute, attacking hacienda, or killing particularly abusive encomendero. Spanish suppressed these rebellions through overwhelming violence.

The Pattern of Suppression: Massacre as Response

Spanish response to indigenous resistance followed consistent pattern: disproportionate violence and collective punishment. When indigenous community rebelled, Spanish didn't just suppress the rebellion—they destroyed entire communities and massacred inhabitants as lessons to others.

The logic was deterrence. Spanish ruled through fear. Each rebellion that was crushed violently served as warning to other communities considering resistance. The message: Resistance brings death not just to rebels but to everyone around them.

Examples from colonial period:

1625 Indigenous uprising in western El Salvador: Multiple Pipil communities refused tribute and attacked Spanish estates. Spanish military forces suppressed uprising, executing hundreds. Villages involved in rebellion were burned; survivors were enslaved or forced into obrajes.

1660s Labor resistance: Indigenous communities in Sonsonate region fled to avoid indigo work. Spanish organized manhunt, capturing hundreds and forcing them into obrajes. Those who resisted were publicly whipped or executed as examples.

1785 Sonsonate resistance: Indigenous workers at indigo obrajes refused to work citing excessive mortality. Spanish colonial governor sent troops. Workers' leaders were arrested, tried for rebellion, and executed publicly. Other workers were forced back into obrajes under armed guard.

The pattern was consistent: Resistance → Spanish military suppression → Executions → Collective punishment → Terror maintaining order.

This violence wasn't excessive by Spanish standards—it was policy. Colonial authorities deliberately used extreme violence to maintain control with minimal Spanish military presence. If indigenous populations believed resistance would bring overwhelming retribution, they would submit. The strategy worked—until it didn't.

1811 and 1814 Uprisings: Elite-Led Independence Movements

In 1811 and 1814, uprisings in San Salvador challenged Spanish authority. But these were NOT indigenous peasant rebellions—they were elite/middle-class movements influenced by independence movements spreading through Spanish America.

November 5, 1811: Father José Matías Delgado, a Creole priest, led uprising in San Salvador demanding autonomous government. Participants included Creole elite, mestizo merchants and artisans, and some indigenous people. Demands were political—local control, end to Spanish-appointed governors, reduced taxes. Spanish authorities suppressed rebellion, arrested leaders, but pardoned most rebels when they submitted.

January 1814: Second uprising with similar composition—Creoles, mestizos, some indigenous. Again suppressed by Spanish troops from Guatemala.

These uprisings mattered because they showed Creole elite growing discontent with Spanish rule. But they weren't social revolutions. Elite rebels didn't challenge land ownership or forced labor. They wanted to manage extraction themselves rather than through Spanish-appointed officials. Indigenous people who participated probably hoped for relief from oppression; they would be disappointed. Independence in 1821 would change little for indigenous majority.

The Equilibrium of Violence

By 1821, Spanish colonial rule in El Salvador had established equilibrium based on violence:

Indigenous population: Terrorized by three centuries of massacres, forced labor, and systematic exploitation. Occasional resistance was crushed. Survival strategy was submission while maintaining cultural practices hidden from Spanish view.

Elite families: 20-30 core families controlled 80%+ of best land, indigo production and export, colonial commerce, and local government. These families had accumulated enormous wealth through forced labor systems that killed workers at industrial rates.

Church: Major landowner and indigo producer, religiously legitimizing Spanish/elite rule, teaching indigenous people that submission was holy.

Spanish Crown: Extracted 10% of indigo wealth through export taxes while maintaining nominal sovereignty, but actual governance was captured by local elite.

Colonial administration: Nominally serving Crown but actually serving elite interests through capture, bribery, and social pressure.

Independence would change this system's flags and rhetoric but not its fundamentals. The same families owning the same land would continue extracting wealth through similar mechanisms. Part 2 examines how colonial architecture survived independence and intensified during 1880s coffee boom—and how the "Fourteen Families" emerged as explicit brand for El Salvador's oligarchy.

END PART 1

Continue to Part 2: Independence and Coffee Oligarchy (1821-1932)

The "Fourteen Families": Five Hundred Years of Oligarchic Control in Central America's Smallest Republic

El Salvador 1524-2025: A Case Study in Concentrated Elite Power and Cyclical Violence

Part 2 of 4: Independence and Coffee Oligarchy (1821-1932)

I. Elite-Managed Independence (1821-1841)

September 15, 1821: The Same Families, Different Flags

On September 15, 1821, the Captaincy General of Guatemala declared independence from Spain. In San Salvador, the news arrived within days. Local Creole elite—led by Father José Matías Delgado and Manuel José Arce—proclaimed El Salvador's adherence to independence. Church bells rang. Celebrations filled streets. Spanish flags came down; new flags went up.

Nothing fundamental changed.

The families controlling colonial indigo economy—Dueñas, Araujo, Regalado, Hill, Meléndez, Quiñónez—continued controlling land and commerce. Indigenous people still worked haciendas under debt peonage and forced labor. Land ownership remained concentrated in 2% of population. The casta racial hierarchy persisted under new terminology (españoles became criollos, but indigenous remained subordinate). Colonial extraction architecture survived intact.

Independence was elite transition, not social revolution. The same men who had enriched themselves through colonial indigo trade now managed their own state. They eliminated Spanish-appointed officials and Spanish export taxes. They kept the profitable parts—land monopoly, forced labor, indigenous subjugation. For indigenous majority, independence meant new flags and rhetoric while exploitation continued.

Annexation to Mexico (1821-1823): Brief Interlude

Immediately after independence, Central American territories faced choice: remain united or fragment. Agustín de Iturbide, who had declared himself Emperor of Mexico, pressured Central America to join Mexican Empire. Salvadoran elite divided:

Pro-annexation faction: Some elite families supported joining Mexico, viewing it as providing stability and protection from potential indigenous uprisings. Large empire meant larger markets for their products.

Anti-annexation faction: Other families wanted autonomy, fearing Mexican government would impose regulations limiting their extraction or take share of their profits.

In January 1822, Salvadoran elite declared annexation to Mexican Empire. Mexican troops arrived to enforce annexation. But Iturbide's empire was unstable—he faced rebellions throughout Mexico. In March 1823, Iturbide abdicated. Central America immediately broke away, declaring itself independent Federal Republic.

This brief Mexican interlude demonstrated elite pragmatism: They would accept any sovereignty arrangement that protected their property and allowed continued extraction. Imperial, republican, federal, unitary—regime form mattered less than maintaining land monopoly.

The Federal Republic of Central America (1823-1841)

Central American territories formed Federal Republic with Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica as constituent states. Federal capital rotated among cities; San Salvador hosted it briefly in 1830s.

The Federal Republic adopted liberal constitution in 1824:

- Proclaimed equality of all citizens
- Ended legal racial castes
- Guaranteed religious freedom (theoretically limiting Church power)
- Promised land reform and indigenous rights protections
- Established elected government and rule of law

In practice, El Salvador's elite ignored these provisions. Constitutional equality was meaningless when 2% owned 80% of land. Religious freedom didn't matter when Catholic Church remained largest landowner and cultural authority. Land reform wasn't implemented. Indigenous rights weren't protected. Elections occurred but were controlled by elite families who had money, literacy, and social networks necessary for political participation.

The Federal Republic's liberal faction (led by Francisco Morazán from Honduras) tried implementing anti-clerical reforms and land redistribution. Conservative faction (strongest in Guatemala under Rafael Carrera) opposed these changes. The conflict escalated to civil wars across Central America in 1830s.

El Salvador's elite split between liberal and conservative factions, but the division was tactical, not fundamental:

Liberals: Wanted to weaken Church (seizing its lands for themselves), modernize economy through free trade, and establish secular education. But liberals didn't challenge elite land monopoly or forced labor systems.

Conservatives: Wanted to preserve Church power and traditional social hierarchies. But conservatives also defended elite property rights and extraction.

Both factions agreed on essentials: Maintaining land concentration, preserving indigenous subjugation, preventing any real redistribution. Their conflicts were about managing elite interests, not about whether elite should dominate.

Instability and Elite Fragmentation (1821-1841)

Unlike Guatemala—where conservative Rafael Carrera established stable military dictatorship serving elite interests from 1839-1865—El Salvador experienced intense factional fighting among elite families in post-independence decades.

Multiple coups, civil conflicts, and political instability marked 1821-1841 period. Elite families competed for control of state apparatus, particularly:

Customs revenue: Whoever controlled government controlled import/export taxes—crucial income in economy dependent on indigo trade

Land distribution: New lands were being opened in eastern El Salvador; government controlled land grants

Labor laws: Government set terms for forced labor systems; control meant ability to shape systems favoring one's own haciendas

Trade monopolies: Government granted licenses and set regulations favoring certain merchants

The fighting was elite competition over spoils, not conflict between different economic systems or visions of society. All factions wanted to preserve land monopoly and extraction; they fought over who would control the state managing extraction.

By 1841, Federal Republic had collapsed. El Salvador became independent republic. Elite families turned to managing extraction through their own sovereign state—preparing ground for what would become most dramatic expansion of elite power in Salvadoran history: the 1881-1882 land seizures and coffee boom.

II. The 1881-1882 Liberal Reforms: The Great Land Theft

Context: Coffee's Rise and Elite Calculations

By the 1850s-1860s, global coffee demand was expanding rapidly. Industrialization in Europe and United States created growing middle classes consuming coffee. Prices rose steadily. Coffee plantations across Latin America were profitable.

El Salvador's volcanic soil and elevation were perfect for coffee. The slopes between 600-1,500 meters in western and central El Salvador—particularly Ahuachapán, Sonsonate, Santa Ana, La Libertad, and San Salvador departments—could produce high-quality arabica coffee commanding premium prices.

There was one problem: The best coffee lands were already occupied.

Some belonged to existing haciendas producing indigo (though indigo prices were declining with introduction of synthetic dyes in 1860s). But substantial portions of coffee-suitable land were held by indigenous communities as *ejidos* (communal lands) or by ladino communities as *tierras comunales* (communal lands). These communities used lands for subsistence farming—maize, beans, squash, small-scale coffee cultivation for local markets.

Elite families wanting to expand into coffee faced legal barriers. Colonial and early republican laws theoretically protected communal lands. Indigenous and ladino communities had legal title to their ejidos and tierras comunales. Elite couldn't simply seize these lands without legal justification.

The solution: Change the law. Declare communal ownership illegal, force privatization, and purchase lands at favorable prices when communities couldn't afford to keep them.

President Rafael Zaldívar: Oligarchy's Servant

Rafael Zaldívar was military officer who became president in 1876 through coup. He ruled until 1885. His presidency's defining achievement—from elite perspective—was facilitating largest land seizure in Salvadoran history.

Zaldívar's ideology was *positivism*—the belief that societies progressed through scientific rationality and modernization. Positivists viewed communal land ownership as "primitive" and "inefficient." Only private property with individual owners maximizing profit through rational calculation could lead to development. Therefore, eliminating communal lands would modernize El Salvador.

This ideology was convenient for elite. Positivism provided intellectual justification for theft. Elite weren't stealing—they were modernizing. They weren't dispossessing indigenous communities—they were bringing efficiency and progress.

In reality, Zaldívar served elite interests directly. The families who would benefit most from land privatization were the same families funding his government, providing loans, and controlling economy. Zaldívar's reforms were elite land grab with philosophical veneer.

Decree of February 26, 1881: Abolishing Indigenous Communal Lands

The first strike came on February 26, 1881, when Zaldívar issued decree abolishing all ejidos (indigenous communal lands). The decree's logic:

1. Communal ownership prevented efficient agriculture
2. Individual ownership would increase productivity
3. Therefore, all ejidos must be divided into individual plots
4. Communities had deadline to complete division
5. Any "surplus" land not distributed to individuals would be declared state property and sold at auction

The decree appeared neutral—it applied to all ejidos regardless of ethnic composition, and it theoretically gave indigenous people opportunity to become individual property owners. In practice, it was designed to dispossess indigenous communities.

The mechanism worked through deliberate obstacles:

Survey costs: Dividing communal lands required surveying to establish boundaries and measure plots. Surveys were expensive. Indigenous communities lacked money to pay surveyors. If they couldn't complete surveys by deadline, their lands became state property.

Individual titles: Even if communities completed surveys, individual indigenous people had to obtain formal property titles. This required navigating Spanish-language legal system, paying fees, traveling to departmental capitals. Most indigenous people couldn't afford this process.

Tax obligations: Individual landowners owed annual property taxes. Indigenous people receiving small plots (2-5 acres) couldn't generate enough income to pay taxes while also subsisting. When they fell behind on taxes, government seized land and auctioned it.

"Surplus" designations: Government officials designating which lands were "surplus" (to be auctioned) were often allied with elite families wanting those lands. Officials generously designated "surplus" any land elite desired.

Auction access: When "surplus" lands went to auction, only elite families and wealthy merchants could afford to purchase. Poor indigenous people couldn't compete. Auctions transferred indigenous lands to elite at below-market prices.

The result: Between 1881-1900, approximately 40-60% of remaining indigenous communal lands were expropriated. Hundreds of thousands of acres transferred from indigenous communities to elite families.

Decree of March 2, 1882: Abolishing Church Lands

The second strike came on March 2, 1882, when Zaldívar decreed nationalization of Church properties. This paralleled Guatemala's 1871 Church land seizures during Barrios reforms.

The decree abolished Church ownership of productive lands. All Church haciendas, estates, and agricultural properties became state property to be sold at auction. Church could retain churches and monasteries themselves but not the lands supporting them.

Liberal ideology justified this: Church was reactionary institution blocking progress. Its vast landholdings were inefficiently managed. Privatizing Church lands would increase productivity and reduce Church political power.

In reality, Church land seizures transferred wealth from one elite faction (Church hierarchy and families with Church connections) to another elite faction (liberal commercial families wanting land for coffee). The sales were often rigged—government officials offered lands to favored buyers before public auctions, or held auctions with limited notice ensuring only connected buyers could participate.

Some Church lands went to existing elite families. Some went to new investors—often European immigrants (particularly Germans) whom Zaldívar's government was actively recruiting to develop coffee industry. But in both cases, lands transferred from communal or Church ownership to private elite ownership.

Scale of Expropriation: Numbers and Geography

The combined effect of 1881-1882 decrees was massive land concentration:

Estimated total: 200,000-300,000 acres of communal and Church lands were privatized between 1881-1900

Percentage: This was approximately 40-60% of remaining indigenous/communal lands and virtually all productive Church lands

Beneficiaries: 80-90% went to existing elite families and new coffee planters (many German immigrants)

Geographic concentration: Western departments—Ahuachapán, Sonsonate, Santa Ana, La Libertad—saw highest expropriation because these had best coffee lands

Result by 1900: Perhaps 2% of population owned 60-70% of arable land, up from approximately 50% in 1821. Coffee expansion concentrated land ownership even more than colonial indigo.

Indigenous communities confined to marginal mountain lands insufficient for subsistence were forced to work coffee plantations. Ladino small farmers who lost access to communal lands became wage laborers or sharecroppers. The system created massive landless class dependent on hacienda work for survival—exactly what coffee oligarchy needed.

The "Fourteen Families" Emerge

The families who dominated coffee boom through 1880s-1920s became El Salvador's legendary "Fourteen Families." The actual number was 20-30 core families, but "Fourteen Families" became the brand—shorthand for oligarchy that even Salvadorans used.

Key families:

Dueñas: Colonial roots in indigo trade, transitioned to coffee 1880s-1890s. Accumulated massive estates in western El Salvador. Later diversified into banking, becoming major shareholders in Banco Agrícola Comercial. Still prominent in 2025.

Hill: British/Salvadoran family arriving 1700s, initially involved in indigo export. Hill family became major coffee producers in Santa Ana and La Libertad. Later diversified into banking and finance. Descendants remain elite in 2025.

Meléndez: Coffee fortunes in late 1800s. Family produced three presidents (1913-1927): Carlos Meléndez, Jorge Meléndez, and Alfonso Quiñónez Molina (who married into Meléndez family). Created "Meléndez-Quiñónez dynasty" controlling government during peak coffee prosperity.

Quiñónez Molina: Coffee oligarchs closely allied with Meléndez family through marriage and business. Alfonso Quiñónez Molina was president 1923-1927. Family retained economic power through coffee and later diversification.

Regalado: Colonial-era indigo producers who transitioned to coffee. General Tomás Regalado became president 1898-1903 through military coup. Family's coffee estates were extensive in western departments.

Araujo: Coffee producers with political prominence. Manuel Enrique Araujo was president 1911-1913 (assassinated). Arturo Araujo was president 1931 (overthrown by Martínez coup). Family accumulated substantial coffee wealth despite political setbacks.

Orellana: Coffee estates in central highlands. Family maintained lower political profile but substantial economic power through coffee production and export.

Deininger: German immigrant family arriving 1880s-1890s. Established coffee estates in western El Salvador. German immigrants were actively recruited by Zaldívar government to develop coffee expertise. By 1914, Germans owned approximately 15-20% of coffee estates.

Dalton: British/Salvadoran family in coffee trade. Poet Roque Dalton (1935-1975) descended from this family—his radical politics and later assassination by sectarian leftists represented tragedy of oligarchy's children recognizing system's brutality but unable to escape it.

Álvarez: Coffee producers who later expanded into finance and commerce. Family ownership in major coffee estates and later banking sector.

Guirola: Coffee and sugar producers. Family owned Industrias La Constancia (brewery and beverage production). Diversified into multiple sectors remaining elite through 2025.

Meza-Ayau: Coffee estates and later diversification. Family became major retailers—owned Super Selectos supermarket chain. Remained prominent through 2025.

Salaverría: Coffee oligarchs with extensive estates. Maintained economic prominence through coffee and later diversification.

Sol Millet: Coffee producers and later diversification into multiple sectors. Family maintained elite status across generations.

Additional families: De Sola, Llach, Wright, Cristiani, Borgonovo, Saca, and others. Total core families: approximately 20-30.

These families extensively intermarried. By 1920s, observer tracking marriage records would find they weren't 20 separate families—they were one extended kinship network. Dueñas married Hill married Meléndez married Quiñónez. Every major family connected to every other through multiple marriages across generations.

The "Fourteen Families" weren't conspiracy or myth—they were documented economic concentration. These families controlled 60-70% of coffee production, export trade, banking, and commerce by 1920s. They were El Salvador's economy.

III. Coffee Economy and Labor Coercion (1880-1932)

Coffee Production Requirements

Coffee required specific conditions and substantial capital investment:

Land: Volcanic slopes at 600-1,500 meters elevation with good drainage. Western and central El Salvador's geography was perfect.

Capital: Coffee trees took 3-5 years to produce first harvest. Investors needed capital to purchase land, plant trees, and sustain operations until production began. Processing required expensive facilities—drying patios, depulping machines, warehouses.

Labor: Coffee was labor-intensive crop requiring large seasonal workforce. October-January harvest needed 100,000+ workers by 1900 and 150,000+ by 1920s. Trees required year-round maintenance—weeding, pruning, fertilizing—but harvest demanded enormous temporary workforce.

Only elite families and wealthy investors could meet these requirements. Small farmers couldn't afford multi-year investment. Indigenous communities confined to marginal lands couldn't compete. Coffee required large-scale capitalization—which ensured only oligarchy could dominate production.

The Labor Problem: Creating Landless Workers

Coffee oligarchy's central problem: How to obtain massive seasonal workforce when indigenous and ladino peasants had alternative survival options?

Colonial indigo economy had solved this through encomienda and repartimiento—legal forced labor. But by 1880s, these systems were officially abolished. Republican governments couldn't openly enslave workers. They needed mechanisms creating "voluntary" labor markets where peasants had no choice but to work plantations.

The 1881-1882 land expropriations solved this. By seizing communal lands, government created landless class. Peasants who previously survived through subsistence farming on ejidos now lacked land. They had two options: starve or work coffee plantations. This wasn't legally forced labor—workers were "free" to accept employment. But when the alternative was starvation, "freedom" was meaningless.

The scale of landlessness was staggering. By 1900, approximately 60-70% of rural families were landless or near-landless. By 1920s, this percentage increased to 70-80%. Coffee expansion had created exactly what oligarchy needed: massive desperate workforce with no alternatives.

Mandamiento: Legal Forced Labor Revived

Despite creating landless workforce, coffee oligarchy feared voluntary labor markets wouldn't provide enough workers at sufficiently low wages. Solution: revive forced labor through *mandamiento* system.

Mandamiento worked through local authorities. Coffee planters needing workers informed departmental governors how many workers they needed. Governors ordered municipal authorities to provide workers from their jurisdictions. Municipal officials assigned quotas to communities—each community had to supply X number of workers for Y weeks.

Communities couldn't refuse. Officials compiled lists of men aged 16-50 and assigned individuals to labor gangs. Men who didn't report were arrested and delivered to plantations by force. The system was legally justified as fulfilling "citizen obligation to national development"—rhetoric disguising forced labor.

Mandamiento workers received minimal wages—typically 1-2 pesos daily when subsistence required 3-4 pesos. Workers labored 12-16 hour days during harvest season. Housing was minimal—workers slept in open-air barracks or under trees. Food was insufficient—plantations provided tortillas and beans, barely enough to sustain heavy labor.

The system was slavery in all but name. Workers were forced to work, couldn't leave, and received wages below subsistence. The only difference from chattel slavery: workers weren't

owned permanently and had theoretical right to leave after fulfilling mandamiento obligation. But since another mandamiento could be imposed next season, the distinction meant little.

Debt Peonage: Permanent Bondage

Parallel to mandamiento, coffee oligarchy developed sophisticated debt peonage systems making workers permanently bonded to plantations.

The mechanism:

Advance payments: Coffee planters provided advance payments (*habilitaciones*) to workers months before harvest—loans for weddings, funerals, illness, or simply survival during hungry season before maize harvest. These loans typically ranged from 5-20 pesos.

Interest accumulation: Loans carried interest (5-15% monthly). Poor workers couldn't repay quickly, allowing interest to accumulate.

Below-subsistence wages: Plantation wages were set deliberately below subsistence level. Workers earned 1-2 pesos daily but needed 3-4 pesos for family survival. Even during harvest season when working continuously, workers fell deeper into debt.

Hacienda stores: Plantations operated stores (*tiendas de raya*) where workers were required to purchase necessities. Stores charged inflated prices—200-300% above market rates. Workers' wages went directly to store debts.

Fraudulent accounting: Plantation bookkeepers maintained workers' debt accounts. Workers were usually illiterate and couldn't verify accounting. Bookkeepers systematically inflated debts, adding charges for "damages" or "advances" workers never received.

Inherited debts: When worker died, debts passed to sons. Families could be bonded across generations—grandfather's debt became father's became son's.

Legal enforcement: Salvadoran law made debt nonpayment a crime. Workers attempting to leave plantations while in debt could be arrested, jailed, and forcibly returned to plantations. Rural police (*Guardia Nacional*, established 1912) enforced these laws, functioning as oligarchy's private slave-catchers.

The result: Workers who accepted initial loan became permanently bonded. They could never work off debt because wages were below subsistence and accounting was fraudulent. Entire families worked plantations generation after generation, legally "free" but actually enslaved.

Vagrancy Laws: Criminalizing Landlessness

Coffee oligarchy's third labor control mechanism was vagrancy laws criminalizing unemployment.

Laws passed in 1880s-1890s defined "vagrants" as men without property or stable employment. Since land expropriations had made 70% of rural population landless, this criminalized majority of rural men. Police could arrest any landless man not carrying documentation proving employment.

The documentation system worked through *libretas* (labor passbooks). Every rural worker was required to carry libreta documenting:

- Current employer
- Outstanding debts
- Previous employment history
- Any legal infractions

Employers controlled libretas, recording workers' debts and behavior. When worker completed employment, employer noted this in libreta—but also recorded any new debts, ensuring worker remained bonded.

Police enforced vagrancy laws by demanding libretas from any rural man they encountered. Men without libretas or with libretas showing debts or unemployment were arrested. Arrested "vagrants" were sentenced to forced labor on coffee plantations—delivered to planters needing workers.

The system created closed loop: Land theft → landlessness → criminalization of landlessness → forced labor → debt → continued bondage. Every mechanism reinforced others. Workers who escaped debt peonage faced arrest as vagrants. Workers who avoided mandamiento accumulated debts requiring plantation work. Workers who tried to subsist independently were pushed off remaining lands or arrested for vagrancy.

Comparison to Guatemala: More Compressed, More Desperate

El Salvador's labor systems were identical to Guatemala's mandamiento and debt peonage, but with crucial difference: intensity.

Guatemala's larger territory (42,000 square miles) provided some escape valves. Indigenous communities could flee to remote mountains. Migrant workers could move between regions. Population density was lower, reducing competition for scarce land.

El Salvador's smaller territory (8,124 square miles) eliminated these options. There was nowhere to hide. Every region was accessible to police. Population density was higher—by 1900, El Salvador had approximately 140 people per square mile vs. Guatemala's 35 per square mile. More people competing for less land meant more desperate workers accepting worse conditions.

The result: El Salvador's forced labor systems were more brutal than Guatemala's. Wages were lower. Debt was more permanent. Violence was more frequent. Elite controlled population more tightly because geography left fewer options for escape.

This compression would have consequences. When landless peasants eventually organized in late 1920s, elite's response would be even more violent than typical Latin American patterns. The 1932 massacre wasn't aberration—it was logical outcome of system requiring extreme violence to maintain control in compressed space.

IV. Elite Control of State: Dynasties and Dictatorships (1871-1931)

The Coffee Oligarchy Capturing Presidency

Unlike Guatemala—where military dictators (Barrios, Estrada Cabrera, Ubico) served coffee oligarchy's interests—El Salvador's elite directly controlled presidency. Between 1898-1931, presidents were either members of coffee families themselves or military officers completely subordinate to oligarchy.

This direct elite rule was possible because El Salvador's smaller size meant simpler political control. Elite families knew each other personally, intermarried, and could coordinate easily. They didn't need military intermediary—they were the state.

Key presidents from oligarchy (1898-1931):

General Tomás Regalado (1898-1903): Coffee planter and military strongman. Seized presidency through coup 1898. His presidency consolidated coffee oligarchy's power after Liberal reforms. Regalado's family owned extensive coffee estates in western departments. His government protected coffee interests through labor laws, land policies, and suppression of worker organizing.

Pedro José Escalón (1903-1907): Member of coffee oligarchy. Escalón family owned large estates. Presidency maintained policies favoring coffee: infrastructure development connecting plantations to ports, continued labor coercion, suppression of peasant resistance.

Dr. Manuel Enrique Araujo (1911-1913): From Araujo coffee family. Attempted modest reforms including limited workers' rights and education expansion. Assassinated February 1913—likely by conservatives fearing reforms threatened elite interests. Assassination demonstrated oligarchy wouldn't tolerate even moderate reformism.

Carlos Meléndez (1913-1914, 1915-1918): Coffee oligarch from Meléndez family. First member of "Meléndez-Quiñónez dynasty" that would dominate 1913-1927. Maintained coffee interests through government policies favoring planters.

Jorge Meléndez (1919-1923): Carlos's brother. Continued family control of presidency. Coffee boom was at peak during his presidency—high prices after World War I created enormous profits for oligarchy.

Alfonso Quiñónez Molina (1914-1915, 1923-1927): Married into Meléndez family. Completed the dynasty. His presidencies maintained oligarchy control and suppressed growing labor organizing in 1920s.

Pío Romero Bosque (1927-1931): Selected by oligarchy but attempted mild opening. Allowed freer elections and some political organizing. Oligarchy tolerated him because international depression reduced coffee profits, making political concessions seem safer than during prosperity. But when organizing threatened property, oligarchy would act decisively.

The "Meléndez-Quiñónez Dynasty" (1913-1927)

Three related presidents across 14 years represented peak of direct oligarchy rule. The Meléndez and Quiñónez families were interconnected through marriage and business. When Carlos Meléndez's term ended, power passed to his brother Jorge. When Jorge's term ended, power passed to brother-in-law Alfonso Quiñónez Molina.

This wasn't coincidental—it was deliberate family control of state apparatus. The dynasty maintained policies benefiting coffee interests:

Labor laws: Strengthened mandamiento and debt peonage enforcement. Rural police expanded to capture escaped workers.

Land policies: Facilitated continued land concentration. Remaining indigenous ejidos were privatized and sold to coffee planters.

Infrastructure: Government invested in railroads connecting coffee regions to ports, roads serving plantations, and telegraph systems coordinating commerce. These investments were funded through regressive taxation (consumption taxes hitting poor hardest) while benefiting coffee oligarchy directly.

Suppression: Any labor organizing was crushed. Unions were illegal. Strikes were broken through military force. Organizers were imprisoned or killed.

Elections: Were held but controlled. Oligarchy selected candidates. Voting was restricted to literate property-owning men—excluding vast majority. Results were predetermined. Democracy was theater maintaining oligarchy's domestic and international legitimacy.

The dynasty ended in 1927 not because oligarchy lost power but because rotating presidential families was tactical—concentrating power in single family too long risked resentment from other elite factions. Romero Bosque was acceptable compromise candidate from different family but committed to coffee interests.

Elite Unity Despite Factional Conflicts

Coffee oligarchy wasn't monolithic—families competed for specific advantages, disputed particular policies, and maneuvered for presidential control. But competition occurred within consensus on fundamentals:

Land monopoly: All families agreed land must remain concentrated. No discussion of redistribution was tolerable.

Labor coercion: All families needed forced labor systems to maintain coffee profits. They agreed on mandamiento, debt peonage, vagrancy laws, and violent suppression of workers who resisted.

Indigenous subjugation: All families agreed indigenous and poor ladino populations must remain subordinate and exploitable.

State control: All families agreed oligarchy must control government to protect property and suppress challenges.

When workers began organizing in 1920s—forming mutual aid societies, discussing unions, reading socialist literature—elite families united. Their factional disputes were trivial compared to existential threat of organized labor challenging property rights. Unity would manifest in 1932's coordinated genocide.

V. Indigenous and Peasant Organizing (1920s-1932)

Post-WWI Crisis and Radicalization

World War I created temporary coffee boom. Reduced production in other regions increased demand for Central American coffee. Prices rose. Salvadoran coffee oligarchy profited enormously during 1914-1918.

The boom ended catastrophically. After war, prices collapsed. By 1920-1921, coffee prices had fallen 50% from wartime peaks. 1929 Great Depression made collapse worse—prices fell another 50% by 1930-1931.

Oligarchy's response: Squeeze workers harder. Elite maintained profits by cutting wages, increasing work demands, and intensifying debt peonage. If prices fell, workers would absorb costs.

Workers' response: Organize. The crisis radicalized rural workforce. When survival became impossible within existing system, organizing for change became rational strategy despite risks.

Communist Party Formation (1930)

In March 1930, Agustín Farabundo Martí and other leftist intellectuals founded Partido Comunista de El Salvador (PCS)—Communist Party of El Salvador.

Farabundo Martí was born 1893 in Teotepeque (La Libertad department) to small landowner family. He attended university in San Salvador, became involved in student politics, and grew increasingly radical during 1920s. Martí traveled to Mexico, Central America, and United States, connecting with communist movements. He participated in Nicaraguan guerrilla leader Augusto César Sandino's resistance against US occupation (1927-1929), gaining military experience.

By 1930, Martí had returned to El Salvador committed to revolutionary organizing. PCS was formally communist—influenced by Soviet ideology, advocating proletarian revolution, land redistribution, and workers' state. But PCS was tiny urban party—perhaps 200-500 members, primarily intellectuals, artisans, and urban workers. The party's significance came from connecting with rural indigenous organizing, not from its own size.

Indigenous Resistance in Western Departments

Western El Salvador—particularly Sonsonate, Ahuachapán, and La Libertad departments—had highest indigenous population. Indigenous communities in these regions had multiple grievances:

Historical memory: Communities remembered 1881-1882 land expropriations. Elders taught children about stolen ejidos. The theft was living memory—grandparents had worked communal lands before Zaldívar's decrees.

Brutal plantation labor: Indigenous men from western departments supplied bulk of coffee harvest workforce. They experienced mandamiento, debt peonage, and vagrancy laws directly. They knew the system's violence intimately.

Cultural suppression: Ladino authorities treated indigenous languages and customs with contempt. Indigenous people were legally equal citizens (since end of formal casta system) but faced systematic discrimination.

Economic desperation: Depression wages made survival impossible. Families starved while working full-time.

Indigenous communities organized through traditional governance structures—cofradías (religious brotherhoods), municipal councils, and community assemblies. These structures predated Spanish conquest in some cases, had survived colonialism, and provided organizational capacity independent of state.

In 1929-1931, indigenous leaders in western departments increasingly connected with PCS. Martí and other party members traveled to indigenous communities, attended meetings, and discussed common cause: Elite exploitation was source of both urban workers' and rural

indigenous people's suffering. Land redistribution and worker control would benefit all oppressed classes.

This connection was crucial. Indigenous organizing had local legitimacy and organizational capacity. PCS had revolutionary ideology and connections to broader movements. Combined, they posed genuine threat to oligarchy.

1931 Election and Coup

In March 1931, Arturo Araujo was elected president on reform platform. Araujo (from coffee family, though less wealthy than core oligarchy) ran as moderate reformist promising:

- Labor rights and union recognition
- Discussion of land reform
- Social welfare programs
- Democratic governance

Elite feared Araujo's rhetoric even though his actual policies were mild. Any suggestion of land reform or labor rights threatened property. When Araujo took office, oligarchy began planning his removal.

Araujo's presidency was chaotic. Economic depression worsened. Government couldn't pay military salaries. Urban protests increased. Rural organizing intensified. Elite portrayed Araujo as dangerously weak, unable to maintain order.

On December 2, 1931, military officers led by General Maximiliano Hernández Martínez overthrew Araujo in coup. Martínez was Vice President (having been added to ticket as military balance). The coup was bloodless—Araujo went into exile.

Elite welcomed Martínez. He was coffee oligarchy's man—committed to protecting property through any means necessary. His ideology was bizarre mix of right-wing authoritarianism and mysticism (he believed in theosophy, reincarnation, and occult sciences). But his commitment to crushing communism and protecting oligarchy was absolute.

Martínez would prove elite made correct choice: He would conduct genocide preserving their property.

January 1932: The Planned Uprising

PCS and indigenous communities planned uprising for January 22, 1932. Goals were:

- Overthrow Martínez government
- Implement land redistribution
- Establish workers' and peasants' councils
- Create revolutionary government

Planning was extensive. Indigenous communities in Sonsonate, Ahuachapán, and western La Libertad coordinated. Urban workers in San Salvador were organized. PCS established date and strategy.

But planning was also deeply flawed:

Poor armament: Most indigenous participants had machetes. Few had guns. Planners hoped capturing military arsenals would provide weapons, but initial attacks would be nearly unarmed.

Limited scope: Uprising was concentrated in western departments. Eastern and central El Salvador weren't organized. Military could concentrate forces against isolated regions.

Government infiltration: Police had informants within PCS. Martínez knew uprising was planned and approximately when.

Strategic confusion: Different communities had different understandings of plan. Coordination was poor. Some communities thought uprising was general revolution; others thought it was local protest.

On January 18-19, government arrested Martí and other PCS leaders before uprising could begin. Despite leadership arrests, uprising proceeded—indigenous communities felt they'd passed point of no return. Martínez knew arrests might trigger uprising; he was prepared.

VI. La Matanza (The Massacre): January 1932

The Uprising (January 22-24, 1932)

On January 22, indigenous communities and some ladino workers rose across western departments. Actions included:

Attacks on towns: Rebels seized Juayúa, Nahuizalco, Izalco, Tacuba, and other western towns. In some locations, rebels killed government officials, military personnel, and wealthy landowners. Estimates: 50-100 government/elite killed during uprising.

Occupation of estates: Some rebels attacked coffee estates, burning records documenting debts and seizing land. Property was destroyed but killing of estate owners was limited—most had fled to cities when they heard about uprising.

Symbolic acts: Rebels destroyed debt records, land titles, and other documents representing their oppression. They proclaimed land redistribution and indigenous autonomy.

The uprising was poorly armed and coordinated. Military posts that resisted weren't captured. Rebels controlled some rural areas and small towns for 2-3 days but couldn't threaten military strongholds in departmental capitals or San Salvador.

By January 24, military began counterattack. Rebels couldn't hold towns against armed troops. Within 72 hours, uprising was militarily defeated.

The killing had barely begun.

The Response: Systematic Genocide (January 25-February 1932)

On January 25, Martínez declared martial law and unleashed military, police, and civilian militias (volunteered from elite families and ladino towns) to systematically exterminate indigenous populations and suspected communists in western departments.

The strategy was explicit: Kill enough people that survivors would never consider resistance again. This wasn't suppressing a rebellion—this was genocide intended to eliminate indigenous political consciousness through terror.

Methods:

Mass executions: Military and militias went town to town rounding up indigenous men. Anyone who spoke Nahuatl or Pipil, wore traditional dress, or lived in indigenous community was targeted. Men were lined against walls, churches, or trees and shot. Bodies were left displayed in plazas as warnings.

Night raids: Soldiers attacked indigenous villages at night, killing inhabitants in their homes. Villages were burned. Survivors fled to mountains.

Identification: Militias checked hands for calluses suggesting machete use or agricultural work. Men with "Indian hands" were executed regardless of whether they'd participated in uprising. Speaking indigenous language was automatic death sentence. Being in wrong village was fatal.

Public torture: Some executions were deliberately public and brutal. In Izalco's central plaza, soldiers machine-gunned hundreds of indigenous prisoners. In Juayúa, rebels captured during uprising were tortured before execution. The cruelty was intentional—designed to terrorize.

No due process: There were no trials, no investigations, no attempt to distinguish participants from bystanders. Any indigenous person in western departments was potentially subject to killing.

Death Toll: 25,000-30,000 Killed in Two Weeks

Most scholarly estimates place death toll at 25,000-30,000 killed between January 22-February 15, 1932. Some estimates go as high as 40,000.

To grasp scale: El Salvador's total population in 1930 was approximately 1.5 million. 30,000 deaths represented 2% of total population killed in two weeks. That's proportionally equivalent to 6.6 million Americans killed in two weeks in 2025.

Breakdown by region:

- **Sonsonate department**: Perhaps 10,000-15,000 killed (particularly Izalco, Juayúa, Nahuizalco)
- **Ahuachapán department**: 5,000-8,000 killed
- **La Libertad department** (western portions): 3,000-5,000 killed
- **Scattered killings elsewhere**: 2,000-4,000 killed

98-99% of victims were indigenous peasants who had not participated in uprising. They were killed for being indigenous, for living in "wrong" areas, or simply for being available targets when militias needed to fill quotas.

Some communities lost 10-30% of population. Izalco, largest indigenous town, was devastated—thousands killed. Nahuizalco and Juayúa were similarly destroyed. Indigenous demographic presence in western El Salvador was dramatically reduced.

Farabundo Martí's Execution (February 1, 1932)

On February 1, 1932, Martí and two other PCS leaders (Alfonso Luna and Mario Zapata) were executed by firing squad in San Salvador. Martínez's government portrayed executions as justice against communist conspiracy.

Martí became martyr. His name would be invoked by Salvadoran left for next 90 years. The guerrilla coalition that fought 1980-1992 civil war called itself FMLN (Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional)—Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front. Salvadoran leftists viewed 1932 as beginning of revolutionary tradition.

But Martí's death was minor compared to what happened in western countryside. The massacre wasn't about killing communist intellectuals—it was about terrorizing indigenous population into permanent submission.

Cultural Genocide: Erasing Indigenous Identity

Survivors faced choice: Continue identifying as indigenous and risk death, or abandon indigenous identity to survive.

Most chose survival. Within weeks of La Matanza:

Language: Indigenous survivors stopped speaking Nahuatl and Pipil publicly. Parents stopped teaching children indigenous languages. Within one generation, indigenous languages in El Salvador were nearly extinct.

Dress: Traditional indigenous clothing disappeared. Survivors wore ladino clothing to avoid identification.

Customs: Public indigenous religious practices stopped. Traditional governance structures went underground or dissolved. Indigenous cultural markers became dangerous.

Self-identification: Many survivors began identifying as ladinos rather than indigenous. Census data: 1930 census counted approximately 20% of population as indigenous; 1940 census counted less than 5%.

This was cultural genocide. The physical killing in January-February 1932 was accompanied by destruction of indigenous cultural identity. Survivors had to erase their own culture to avoid being targeted for extermination.

By 1950, El Salvador officially claimed to have "no indigenous population"—meaning indigenous identity had been so successfully suppressed that people wouldn't publicly identify as indigenous. El Salvador's indigenous peoples hadn't disappeared; they'd been terrorized into hiding.

Elite Justification and US Support

Martínez and oligarchy justified massacre through several narratives:

Communist conspiracy: Government claimed uprising was communist plot directed by Moscow to overthrow civilization. This was absurd—PCS was tiny party with no significant Soviet support—but it resonated with US and international audiences during 1930s when fear of communism was rising.

Savage Indians: Elite media portrayed indigenous people as violent savages who had murdered innocent civilians during uprising. Massacre was portrayed as necessary defense of civilization against barbarism. This recycled colonial-era narratives about indigenous inferiority.

Necessary order: Government claimed killing was required to restore order and prevent anarchy. Without harsh response, El Salvador would descend into chaos.

These justifications were accepted internationally. US government, which had intervened repeatedly in Central America and Caribbean to protect American business interests and fight "communism," viewed Martínez as valuable anti-communist ally. No international sanctions were imposed. No accountability was demanded.

Domestically, elite celebrated Martínez as savior who had "rescued" El Salvador from communism. Coffee families credited Martínez with protecting their property. He had done exactly what oligarchy needed: used overwhelming violence to eliminate threat to land monopoly.

Pattern Recognition: Guatemala 1954 + 1978-1983 Compressed

La Matanza demonstrated same pattern as Guatemala's violence but compressed:

- Like 1954 CIA coup against Árbenz (who threatened United Fruit's land), 1932 massacre was response to threat to oligarchy's property
- Like 1978-1983 genocide killing 200,000 indigenous Guatemalans, 1932 was systematic ethnic cleansing targeting indigenous populations for political organizing
- But El Salvador's genocide was faster and more concentrated—30,000 killed in weeks rather than years

The compression reflected El Salvador's geography. Smaller territory meant elite could concentrate military force quickly. Higher population density meant more people could be killed in less time. There was nowhere to hide.

1932 established template that would repeat in 1980-1992 civil war: Elite responds to threats to property through genocide, backed by military that serves oligarchy absolutely, justified through anti-communist rhetoric, supported by US government.

VII. Synthesis: The Architecture Consolidated (1821-1932)

By 1932, El Salvador's extraction architecture was fully consolidated:

Land monopoly: 2% owned 60-70% of arable land—concentration higher than 1821 due to coffee expansion

Same families: Dueñas, Hill, Meléndez, Regalado, Araujo, and approximately 20-30 other families controlled economy through coffee, commerce, and finance. These families descended from colonial indigo oligarchy and would remain elite through 2025.

Labor coercion: Mandamiento, debt peonage, and vagrancy laws created forced labor systems producing coffee wealth through coerced indigenous and ladino labor

Violence as control: La Matanza taught lesson: Organizing for land redistribution equals death. This lesson enforced silence for 50 years.

Indigenous destruction: 1932 achieved what Spanish conquest started—near-total elimination of indigenous identity through physical killing and cultural genocide

Elite impunity: Martínez and oligarchy faced no consequences. Massacre was celebrated domestically, tolerated internationally. Perpetrators were heroes.

The "Fourteen Families" brand: By 1932, El Salvador's oligarchy was explicitly understood as small group of intermarried families controlling everything. The brand stuck—"las catorce familias" became shorthand for concentrated elite power.

The pattern established 1524-1821 (land theft, forced labor, racial hierarchy, violence suppressing resistance) intensified 1821-1932. Independence hadn't changed fundamentals. Liberal reforms expanded extraction rather than redistributing wealth. Coffee boom enriched same families that had controlled indigo. And when peasants organized, elite response was genocide.

Part 3 examines 1932-1992: Military dictatorship serving oligarchy, continued violence cycles, US intervention backing elite, civil war killing 75,000, and Peace Accords betraying land reform promises. The pattern would continue because land ownership remained unchanged.

END PART 2

Continue to Part 3: Military Dictatorship and Civil War (1932-1992)

The "Fourteen Families": Five Hundred Years of Oligarchic Control in Central America's Smallest Republic

El Salvador 1524-2025: A Case Study in Concentrated Elite Power and Cyclical Violence

Part 3 of 4: Military Dictatorship and Civil War (1932-1992)

I. Martínez Dictatorship: Foundation of Military Rule (1932-1944)

Maximiliano Hernández Martínez: The Oligarchy's Protector

General Maximiliano Hernández Martínez ruled El Salvador from December 1931 to May 1944—twelve and a half years of military dictatorship serving coffee oligarchy's interests absolutely. He was the man who conducted La Matanza. He was also the man who established template for sixty years of military rule: The military would govern, but would serve elite economic interests in exchange for enrichment and autonomy.

Martínez's ideology was bizarre. He believed in theosophy, reincarnation, and occult mysticism. He reportedly consulted spirits, believed poverty was karmic punishment for past-life sins, and thought colored lights could cure diseases. He banned certain colors and mandated others on specific days based on numerological calculations. Foreign diplomats found him eccentric to the point of insanity.

But his commitment to protecting oligarchy's property was absolutely rational. Martínez understood what La Matanza had accomplished: It had eliminated organized threat to coffee elite for a generation. His job was maintaining that accomplishment through continued repression while allowing oligarchy to accumulate wealth unmolested.

Policies Serving Elite Interests

Martínez's domestic policies were designed to preserve extraction architecture:

Land monopoly maintained: No land reform was discussed. No redistribution was considered. The 2% who owned 60-70% of land in 1932 still owned it in 1944. Coffee estates remained concentrated in same families—Dueñas, Hill, Meléndez, Regalado, and others.

Labor organizing banned: Any attempt to form unions, organize workers, or advocate for labor rights was treated as communism. Organizers were imprisoned, tortured, or killed. Strikes were illegal. The lesson of 1932—organizing equals death—was continuously reinforced.

Press censorship: Martínez controlled media. Newspapers that criticized government were shut down. Journalists who reported on repression were arrested. Elite-owned newspapers praised Martínez for maintaining "order."

Political repression: Opposition parties were banned or restricted. Elections were held but were fraudulent—Martínez predetermined outcomes. Constitutional norms were suspended when inconvenient. Congress was rubber stamp for Martínez's decrees.

Indigenous surveillance: After 1932, indigenous communities that survived were kept under permanent surveillance. Any gathering was suspicious. Speaking indigenous languages publicly remained dangerous. Cultural practices were monitored. The cultural genocide of 1932 was maintained through continued pressure.

But Martínez didn't just repress—he also provided benefits to oligarchy:

Infrastructure development: Government invested in roads connecting coffee estates to ports, improved rail lines, and expanded port facilities. These investments were funded through regressive taxation (consumption taxes hitting poor hardest) but benefited coffee exporters directly.

Currency stability: Martínez maintained monetary policies favoring export elite. Currency was kept stable relative to US dollar, protecting coffee exporters' dollar-denominated revenues.

Military as labor enforcers: Military and rural police (Guardia Nacional) continued enforcing mandamiento, debt peonage, and vagrancy laws. Coffee planters could rely on state violence to maintain labor discipline.

The arrangement was explicit: Military ruled, oligarchy made money. Officers accumulated wealth through land grants, business partnerships with elite, and corruption. Elite families financed military and allowed officers autonomy in governance. Both groups benefited from extraction continuing.

The Military-Oligarchy Alliance Formalized

Post-1932, El Salvador's military wasn't neutral institution serving national interest—it was oligarchy's enforcement arm receiving benefits in exchange for protection.

The alliance worked through several mechanisms:

Officer recruitment: Military officers increasingly came from middle-class or elite families. Sons of coffee oligarchs attended military academy, ensuring officer corps shared elite values. Officers who didn't come from elite backgrounds were co-opted through:

Land grants: Successful military officers received coffee estates or land suitable for coffee. Generals accumulated substantial properties. This made officers stakeholders in land monopoly they were protecting.

Business partnerships: Elite families included officers in business ventures—coffee export companies, commerce, urban real estate. Officers invested profits from corruption and land grants into these ventures, creating financial ties to oligarchy.

Marriage: Officers married into elite families or married daughters to elite sons. By 1940s, many military officers were related by marriage to coffee oligarchy. Social networks merged.

Shared ideology: Officers and oligarchy shared anti-communism. Any challenge to property was communism requiring elimination. This ideological unity made coordination easy.

The result: By 1944, military and oligarchy were unified bloc. They had different functions—oligarchy accumulated wealth through production and export, military maintained order through violence—but they were partners protecting same system.

This pattern would continue for sixty years. Even as individual officers and elite families changed, the alliance structure persisted. Guatemala's military similarly served coffee oligarchy, but El Salvador's alliance was more direct and explicit—likely because El Salvador's smaller size made coordination easier.

US Support: Implicit Approval

United States government supported Martínez throughout his dictatorship. The support was less intense than US intervention in Guatemala, Nicaragua, or elsewhere, but it was consistent.

US reasons for support:

Anti-communism: Martínez's 1932 massacre "proved" his commitment to fighting communism. In 1930s-1940s context of rising fears about Soviet influence, Martínez was valuable ally.

Economic stability: Martínez maintained environment for US business interests. American companies operated in El Salvador without interference. Currency was stable. Property rights (for foreigners and elite) were absolute.

Regional order: US viewed Central America through Cold War lens even before Cold War formally began. Stable anti-communist governments throughout region served US strategic interests.

US support took forms:

Recognition: US government formally recognized Martínez regime despite its obvious authoritarianism and massacre. Recognition conferred international legitimacy.

Trade: US remained largest market for Salvadoran coffee. Trade continued uninterrupted, providing revenue sustaining Martínez government.

No sanctions: US imposed no diplomatic or economic sanctions for La Matanza. No accountability was demanded. Massacre was treated as internal matter.

Military contacts: US military maintained informal contacts with Salvadoran military, providing advice and occasionally training. Nothing compared to later intervention, but contacts established relationships.

The pattern established: US would back authoritarian regimes protecting property and fighting communism, regardless of human rights violations. This would intensify dramatically in 1980s.

1944 Overthrow: Elite Limits on Dictatorship

In 1944, Martínez attempted to extend his presidency beyond constitutional limits. He had already ruled twelve years through constitutional manipulations. Now he wanted to continue indefinitely.

Elite and middle-class professionals opposed extension—not because they opposed Martínez's policies but because they feared concentration of power in one man threatened their own interests. Oligarchy wanted military rule, but wanted military that rotated leadership and accommodated different elite factions.

April-May 1944: General strike and protests spread across San Salvador and other cities. Students, professionals, middle-class merchants, and some workers participated. Guatemala's October Revolution that would overthrow Ubico (June 1944) and bring Arévalo to power influenced Salvadoran protesters—they saw possibility of change.

Martínez attempted repression but faced resistance from within military. Younger officers saw continuation as destabilizing. Under pressure from protests and military factionalism, Martínez resigned May 9, 1944, and fled to Honduras.

But there was no democratic opening. Military remained in control. The lesson: Elite would tolerate dictatorship but not personal rule that became too concentrated. They wanted oligarchy-serving military dictatorship, not cult of personality. Martínez's successor would be military officer acceptable to oligarchy.

The overthrow changed personnel but not system. Land ownership was unchanged. Military-oligarchy alliance was unchanged. Repression of labor organizing was unchanged. 1932's lesson—organizing equals death—remained in force.

II. Military Regimes Serving Oligarchy (1944-1979)

The Pattern: Rotating Military Dictators

From 1944 to 1979, El Salvador was governed by series of military officers who ruled through combination of fraudulent elections, coups, and repression. The roster:

1944-1948: Military juntas (transitional)
1948-1956: Lieutenant Colonel Óscar Osorio
1956-1960: Lieutenant Colonel José María Lemus
1960-1961: Military junta
1961-1962: Civic-Military Directory
1962-1967: Lieutenant Colonel Julio Adalberto Rivera
1967-1972: Colonel Fidel Sánchez Hernández
1972-1977: Colonel Arturo Armando Molina
1977-1979: General Carlos Humberto Romero

Different names, same pattern: Military officers selected by military institution, validated through fraudulent elections, governing to protect elite interests while enriching themselves and officer corps.

PRUD and PCN: Military's Political Parties

The military created political parties providing electoral legitimacy:

PRUD (Revolutionary Party of Democratic Unification, 1948-1960): First military party. "Revolutionary" in name only—it was conservative party defending status quo. Function was legitimizing military rule through elections.

PCN (Party of National Conciliation, 1961-1979): Replaced PRUD. PCN dominated politics for eighteen years through controlled elections. Party membership was officially open, but PCN was military-oligarchy party representing landowners, business elite, and military officers.

These parties held regular elections. El Salvador appeared democratic—presidents were "elected," congresses met, political debate occurred. Reality was different:

Electoral fraud: Military predetermined election outcomes. Vote counting was controlled. Opposition victories were nullified. Results reflected military preferences, not voter choices.

Opposition restricted: Leftist parties were banned or harassed. Christian Democrats and moderate opposition were allowed to participate (providing democratic appearance) but were prevented from winning through fraud.

Media control: Elite-owned media promoted PCN and attacked opposition. Independent journalism was suppressed.

Violence: Opposition candidates and activists faced intimidation, imprisonment, or assassination. The threat of violence discouraged opposition organizing.

The system was authoritarian rule with democratic facade. For international audiences (particularly US), El Salvador had elections and political parties. Domestically, everyone understood military controlled outcomes and opposition had no path to power.

Modest Reforms vs. Elite Resistance (1950s-1960s)

Some military officers in 1950s-1960s attempted modest reforms acknowledging that extreme inequality and repression created instability:

Social Security: Instituto Salvadoreño del Seguro Social (ISSS) established 1949-1950, providing healthcare and pensions to some urban workers. Coverage was limited—rural workers (vast majority) were excluded—but it represented small expansion of social services.

Urban labor rights: Some urban workers gained limited rights to organize unions (with heavy restrictions). Strikes remained mostly illegal, but some professional unions were tolerated.

Infrastructure: Government invested in roads, electricity, water systems, and schools. These investments improved conditions for middle class and urban workers while also benefiting elite through economic development.

Industrialization: 1950s-1960s saw import-substitution industrialization. Government provided incentives for establishing factories producing consumer goods previously imported. Elite families diversified from coffee into cement, textiles, beer, food processing.

But reforms never approached land redistribution or challenging coffee oligarchy:

No agrarian reform: Every time reform was discussed, oligarchy mobilized to block it. Military officers who proposed land redistribution faced removal. The lesson: Touch land ownership and you're finished.

Continued labor repression: Rural organizing remained illegal. Any peasant organization was treated as communism. Rural police and military continued enforcing debt peonage and breaking strikes.

Elite veto: When reforms threatened elite interests, oligarchy used multiple tools—threatening capital flight, mobilizing media campaigns, bribing or removing officials, organizing business shutdowns. Military learned to avoid policies oligarchy opposed.

The relationship was clear: Military could govern and accumulate wealth as long as it protected elite property. Reforms that didn't threaten property were acceptable. Reforms challenging land monopoly were prohibited.

1969 "Soccer War" with Honduras

In July 1969, El Salvador and Honduras fought four-day war triggered by tensions surrounding soccer matches (World Cup qualifying). The real causes were deeper.

Background: El Salvador's land crisis meant 100,000+ Salvadoran peasants had migrated to Honduras between 1930s-1960s seeking land. Honduras, also land-scarce with its own oligarchy, resented Salvadoran migration. In 1969, Honduras passed agrarian reform expelling Salvadoran migrants from occupied lands.

Precipitating events: During tense World Cup qualifying matches (El Salvador vs. Honduras), violence broke out between fans. Honduran attacks on Salvadorans living in Honduras escalated. El Salvador mobilized military for "protection."

The war (July 14-18, 1969): El Salvador invaded Honduras. Four days of fighting involved air strikes, tank battles, and infantry combat. Casualties were modest (2,000-3,000 total military and civilian deaths), but economic damage was substantial. Organization of American States negotiated ceasefire July 18.

Consequences: Honduras expelled 300,000 Salvadorans. They returned to El Salvador—adding to already desperate landless population. Salvadoran oligarchy made no effort to accommodate returned migrants with land distribution. The land pressure that had driven migration intensified.

Why this matters: Soccer War demonstrated El Salvador's land crisis was unsustainable. Oligarchy's response to landlessness was encouraging migration. When that safety valve closed, pressure built toward explosion. Returned migrants needed land. Oligarchy refused redistribution. Violence was inevitable.

The war also militarized society further. Military's institutional prestige increased. Officers gained combat experience. Defense spending expanded. The military became even more central to governance and more confident in using force.

III. Economic Diversification and ARENA Formation (1960s-1980s)

Beyond Coffee: Elite Diversification

From 1960s onward, coffee oligarchy diversified into new sectors while maintaining coffee dominance:

Banking: 1960s banking sector consolidated as government relaxed regulations. Elite families established or purchased banks. By 1980s, five families controlled 70-80% of banking:

- Dueñas family: Major shareholders in Banco Agrícola Comercial
- Gutiérrez family: Controlled banking operations
- Elite consortium: Controlled multiple banks through cross-ownership

Industry: Import-substitution industrialization created opportunities:

- Novella family: Owned Cementos Progreso (cement monopoly)
- Castillo family: Owned Cervecería La Constancia (brewery/beverage)
- Multiple families: Invested in textiles, food processing, construction materials

Retail and commerce:

- Meza-Ayau family: Developed supermarket chains (Super Selectos)
- Multiple families: Controlled import-export companies

Sugar production:

- Multiple elite families: Expanded sugar cultivation on Pacific coast
- Same families: Often owned both coffee and sugar estates

Real estate:

- Elite families: Invested coffee profits in urban real estate as San Salvador grew
- Land speculation: Elite purchased land around expanding urban areas

The diversification was strategic. Coffee remained profitable but was vulnerable to price fluctuations. Elite families used coffee wealth to establish monopolies or oligopolies in other sectors, creating multiple revenue streams. By 1980s, the "Fourteen Families" controlled banking, industry, commerce, agriculture, and real estate—dominating entire formal economy.

Importantly: The same families dominated all sectors. This wasn't new elite displacing old—it was coffee oligarchy transforming into diversified oligarchy while maintaining core membership. Dueñas, Hill, Cristiani, Meza-Ayau, and other families appearing in coffee boom appeared in 1980s diversified economy.

ANEP: Coordinating Oligarchy Interests

In 1966, elite families established ANEP (Asociación Nacional de la Empresa Privada—National Association of Private Enterprise). ANEP was business lobby coordinating elite economic and political interests.

ANEP's structure:

- Membership included chambers of commerce, agriculture, industry, finance, and construction
- Leadership came from core oligarchy families

- Function was unified business voice lobbying government

ANEP's power:

- Any government threatening elite faced ANEP opposition
- ANEP could organize capital strikes (businesses closing simultaneously)
- ANEP controlled media messaging through member-owned newspapers and TV
- ANEP provided funding to military governments and later to ARENA party

ANEP was El Salvador's equivalent to Guatemala's CACIF (Coordinating Committee of Agricultural, Commercial, Industrial, and Financial Associations). Both organizations formalized oligarchy coordination, making elite interests explicit and organized rather than informal.

When agrarian reform was proposed in 1970s, ANEP mobilized against it. When reformist coup occurred in 1979, ANEP funded death squads. When peace accords were negotiated in 1992, ANEP ensured land redistribution was minimized. ANEP was institutional expression of oligarchy unity.

1980: ARENA Party Formation

In 1980, as reformist military junta threatened elite interests, oligarchy created ARENA (Alianza Republicana Nacionalista—Nationalist Republican Alliance) as political party.

Founder: Roberto D'Aubuisson—Major in Salvadoran military, intelligence officer, and death squad organizer. D'Aubuisson was virulently anti-communist, personally violent, and completely committed to protecting oligarchy. He organized death squads that assassinated Archbishop Romero (1980) and thousands of others. He would lead ARENA until his death from cancer in 1992.

Ideology: Extreme anti-communism combined with free-market fundamentalism. ARENA portrayed any reform as communist threat. Party advocated absolute property rights, minimal government regulation, and military suppression of opposition.

Funding: Coffee families and diversified elite funded ARENA. Particularly prominent supporters included:

- Cristiani family (coffee and pharmaceuticals)—Alfredo Cristiani would become ARENA president 1989-1994
- Multiple core oligarchy families provided financing
- Business elite organized through ANEP backed ARENA as their political vehicle

Function: ARENA was oligarchy's political arm. Unlike PCN (military's party that became independent), ARENA was created by and for elite. The party's purpose was ensuring oligarchy interests controlled government whether military or civilian rule prevailed.

ARENA would dominate Salvadoran politics from 1982-2009 (winning five consecutive presidential elections), providing democratic legitimacy to oligarchy rule through electoral victories rather than military coups.

The formation of ARENA in 1980—midst of escalating civil war—demonstrated elite's sophistication. They understood military dictatorship was becoming internationally unacceptable. Solution: Create political party that could win elections through combination of elite financing, media control, anti-communist messaging, and when necessary, death squad violence against opposition.

IV. Reform Attempts and Elite Backlash (1970s-1980)

Growing Pressure for Change (1970s)

By 1970s, El Salvador's extraction system faced mounting contradictions:

Landlessness: 60-70% of rural families were landless or near-landless. Population growth meant more people competing for same scarce land. Land monopoly was literally unsustainable.

Urbanization: Rural migrants flooded San Salvador creating massive slums. By 1980, San Salvador metropolitan area had over 1 million people (in country of 5 million) living in overcrowded, under-serviced conditions.

Economic stagnation: While elite prospered, majority lived in poverty. Wages were stagnant. Employment opportunities were scarce. Central American Common Market (created 1960s) provided some growth but benefits accrued primarily to elite.

Political exclusion: Fraudulent elections and military rule meant no peaceful path to change. Moderate opposition parties couldn't win even when they received most votes.

Regional context: Nicaragua's Sandinista revolution (1979) demonstrated guerrilla movements could overthrow oligarchy-serving dictatorships. El Salvador's left drew inspiration and strategic lessons.

Catholic radicalization: Liberation theology—Latin American Catholic movement emphasizing social justice and "preferential option for the poor"—spread through Salvadoran Catholic Church. Priests organized peasant communities, taught literacy, and advocated for land reform. Base Ecclesial Communities (CEBs) became organizing centers challenging official Church conservatism and government authority.

1972 Fraudulent Election: The Door Closes

In 1972 presidential election, José Napoleón Duarte—Christian Democrat running on moderate reform platform—likely won honestly. Duarte promised:

- Modest land reform
- Labor rights expansion
- Anti-corruption measures
- Democratic governance

Exit polls and initial returns suggested Duarte victory. Military and oligarchy couldn't accept this. Christian Democrats would likely implement reforms threatening property. On election night, vote counting stopped. When counting resumed, PCN candidate Colonel Arturo Armando Molina was declared winner.

The fraud was blatant—everyone knew Duarte had won. Duarte protested. Military response: arrested Duarte, tortured him, and exiled him to Venezuela. The message was clear—electoral reform was impossible. Military and oligarchy wouldn't allow opposition victory regardless of vote totals.

The stolen 1972 election was turning point. Moderate reformists concluded peaceful change was blocked. Some Christian Democrats and Catholic activists radicalized, joining or supporting guerrilla movements forming in rural areas. If elections were meaningless, armed struggle became logical option.

October 15, 1979 Coup: Young Officers' Reform Attempt

In October 1979, young military officers overthrew General Carlos Humberto Romero (1977-1979 president) in coup attempting to implement reforms before full-scale revolution erupted.

Context: Sandinistas had just overthrown Somoza dictatorship in Nicaragua (July 1979). Salvadoran officers feared El Salvador would be next. They calculated that preemptive reforms—land redistribution, democratic opening, human rights improvements—could prevent revolution.

The junta: Reformist officers formed junta including:

- Progressive military officers
- Christian Democrat civilians (including Duarte later)
- Social democrat intellectuals

Promised reforms:

- Agrarian reform redistributing land to peasants
- Nationalization of banks and coffee export (to break elite's financial control)
- Human rights improvements
- Negotiations with opposition including leftist parties

US support: Carter administration backed coup. US feared "another Nicaragua" and calculated that reform junta could prevent revolution. US provided immediate recognition and aid.

But reforms threatened elite existentially. Land redistribution would destroy basis of oligarchy's power. Nationalizing banks and export would eliminate key wealth accumulation mechanisms. Elite response was immediate and violent.

Oligarchy's Response: Death Squads and Terror

Elite families organized death squads systematically assassinating anyone supporting reforms:

Targets:

- Union leaders organizing workers
- Peasant organizers advocating land reform
- Teachers educating about rights
- Students protesting military rule
- Priests practicing liberation theology
- Christian Democrat politicians supporting reforms
- Journalists reporting on repression
- Anyone suspected of leftist sympathies

Methods:

- Kidnapping: Death squads (often off-duty military, police, or paramilitaries funded by elite) kidnapped targets from homes, workplaces, or streets
- Torture: Victims were tortured for information about other activists
- Murder: Bodies were dumped on roadsides, in ravines, or left in public places as warnings
- Mutilation: Many bodies showed signs of torture—missing fingers, burned with acid, castrated—intended to terrorize

Scale: 1980-1981, death squads killed 10,000-15,000 people—approximately 30-40 people per day. Bodies appeared daily on roadsides throughout country. Going to work meant passing corpses. The terror was comprehensive and constant.

Elite involvement: Death squads were organized by military intelligence officers (particularly D'Aubuisson) but funded by oligarchy. Elite families provided money, vehicles, safe houses, and weapons. Some elite family members personally participated in planning assassinations.

Impunity: No death squad members were prosecuted. Military and courts protected them. Police didn't investigate. The state wasn't just tolerating death squads—state forces were death squads.

The strategy was explicit: Kill enough people that survivors would be too terrified to support reforms. This was terrorism in technical sense—systematic violence against civilians to achieve political goal of preventing reform.

V. Archbishop Óscar Romero and Elite Violence

Romero's Transformation (1977-1980)

Óscar Arnulfo Romero was appointed Archbishop of San Salvador in February 1977. His appointment pleased elite and military—Romero was considered conservative, cautious, and unlikely to challenge authority.

They were wrong.

What changed Romero:

- March 12, 1977: Father Rutilio Grande, Jesuit priest organizing peasants in Aguilares, was assassinated along with two companions by death squad. Grande was Romero's friend. The assassination shook Romero profoundly.
- Continued violence: Week after week, priests, nuns, catechists, and lay workers were murdered. Romero witnessed Church workers killed for practicing Christianity as he understood it.
- Pastoral exposure: As Archbishop, Romero traveled throughout El Salvador meeting poor communities. He saw poverty, landlessness, and state violence directly.

Romero transformed from cautious conservative to prophetic voice for poor. His weekly Sunday homilies (broadcast on radio YSAX, reaching entire country) became events where Salvadorans heard truth about violence, learned names of disappeared, and heard denunciations of military and oligarchy.

Romero's message:

- The poor were beloved by God
- Land should belong to those who worked it
- Military and death squads were committing murder
- Elite's wealth was stolen from peasants
- Repression must end
- Reforms including land redistribution were necessary for peace

Romero documented violence meticulously. Each week's homily listed names of killed, disappeared, and tortured. He read letters from families seeking missing loved ones. He described specific massacres. His homilies were historical records of government violence.

Romero's international stature grew. He was nominated for Nobel Peace Prize. Pope John Paul II (conservative and anti-communist) was uncomfortable with Romero's radicalism but couldn't silence him. International media covered Romero's denunciations. Elite couldn't dismiss him as communist propagandist—he was Archbishop of Catholic Church.

Romero's Final Homily: March 23, 1980

On March 23, 1980, Romero delivered homily directly addressing Salvadoran soldiers and police:

"I would like to make a special appeal to the men of the army, and specifically to the ranks of the National Guard, the police, and the military. Brothers, you come from our own people. You are killing your own brother peasants when any human order to kill must be subordinate to the law of God which says, 'Thou shalt not kill.' No soldier is obliged to obey an order contrary to the law of God. No one has to obey an immoral law. It is high time you recovered your consciences and obeyed your consciences rather than a sinful order. The church, the defender of the rights of God, of the law of God, of human dignity, of the person, cannot remain silent before such an abomination. We want the government to face the fact that reforms are valueless if they are to be carried out at the cost of so much blood. In the name of God, in the name of this suffering people whose cries rise to heaven more loudly each day, I implore you, I beg you, I order you in the name of God: stop the repression!"

The homily was broadcast throughout El Salvador. It was direct challenge to military and elite—Archbishop was ordering soldiers to disobey orders to kill. For oligarchy, this was intolerable. Romero had to be eliminated.

March 24, 1980: Romero's Assassination

The next day, March 24, 1980, Archbishop Óscar Romero was murdered while celebrating evening mass at chapel of Divine Providence cancer hospital in San Salvador.

The assassination:

- Romero was at altar giving homily
- Assassin entered chapel, aimed rifle, and shot Romero once through the heart
- Romero died instantly
- Assassin escaped in waiting vehicle

Who killed Romero: Roberto D'Aubuisson organized assassination. This was confirmed by:

- UN Truth Commission investigation (1992-1993)
- Multiple witnesses' testimony
- Documents found in D'Aubuisson's safe after his death
- Subsequent investigations and confessions

D'Aubuisson organized assassination with financial backing from elite families and oligarchy. The decision to kill Archbishop was made by oligarchy—represented by ARENA founders and supporters—who viewed Romero as existential threat legitimizing land reform and delegitimizing their rule.

Elite response: Privately, elite celebrated. Romero had been "communist sympathizer" threatening their interests. His death was necessary. Publicly, they expressed hollow condolences while blaming "extremists from both sides."

Impact: Romero's assassination galvanized opposition. He became martyr. His message reached wider audience. Peasant communities that had hesitated to join guerrillas now saw no alternative to armed struggle. Romero's death proved elite would kill anyone—even Archbishop—who challenged land monopoly.

Pattern recognition: Like Spanish Embassy massacre in Guatemala (January 1980, killing 39 including indigenous leaders), Romero's assassination demonstrated elite would commit any atrocity to protect property. The brutality wasn't excessive—it was strategic. Make examples of prominent victims to terrorize broader population.

VI. The Civil War (1980-1992): 75,000 Dead Protecting Land Monopoly

Formation of FMLN (October 1980)

On October 10, 1980, five guerrilla organizations merged forming FMLN (Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional—Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front):

Component organizations:

1. **FPL** (Fuerzas Populares de Liberación—Popular Liberation Forces): Largest, founded 1970 by Salvador Cayetano Carpio
2. **ERP** (Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo—People's Revolutionary Army): Founded 1972, militarily aggressive
3. **RN** (Resistencia Nacional—National Resistance): Split from ERP, founded 1975
4. **PRTC** (Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores Centroamericanos—Revolutionary Party of Central American Workers): Smallest, founded 1976
5. **PCS** (Partido Comunista de El Salvador—Communist Party): Founded 1930, oldest organization

Naming: FMLN deliberately invoked Farabundo Martí (executed 1932). The name signaled continuity—1980s struggle was continuation of 1932 uprising crushed through La Matanza. Guerrillas portrayed themselves as completing unfinished revolution.

Composition:

- Rural base: Primarily landless peasants from northern departments (Chalatenango, Morazán, Cabañas)
- Urban supporters: Students, workers, teachers, radicalized Christians
- Leadership: Mix of intellectuals, former military officers (some had defected), and peasant leaders
- Estimated strength: 10,000-15,000 combatants by 1984

Goals:

- Overthrow military-oligarchy regime
- Implement land reform redistributing estates to peasants
- Nationalize banking and major industries
- Create democratic government including left representation
- End US military intervention

Strategy: Combined guerrilla warfare in rural areas with urban organizing, attempting to create "two, three, many Vietnams" (Che Guevara's formulation) spreading government forces thin.

US Intervention: $6 Billion Backing Oligarchy

Reagan administration (1981-1989) intervened massively in El Salvador to prevent "another Nicaragua." US policymakers feared Salvadoran revolution would spread—creating "falling dominoes" of communist governments throughout Central America and threatening US hegemony.

Scale of intervention:

- **$6 billion total aid (1980-1992)**: Approximately $500 million annually
- **$4 billion military aid**: Weapons, ammunition, helicopters, vehicles, communications equipment
- **$2 billion economic aid**: Keeping Salvadoran economy afloat despite war

US military advisors:

- 50-100 US military personnel stationed in El Salvador continuously
- Officially "advisors" prohibited from combat, but they planned operations, trained soldiers, and provided intelligence
- Additional training at US School of Americas (Fort Benning, Georgia) where thousands of Salvadoran officers learned counterinsurgency

Strategy:

- Counterinsurgency doctrine: US taught Salvadoran military to "drain the sea" (Mao's metaphor)—destroy guerrilla support base by terrorizing civilian populations in contested areas
- Hearts and minds failure: Rhetoric about winning popular support through reform was contradicted by systematic violence against civilians

Justification:

- Reagan administration portrayed war as Cold War conflict—Soviet/Cuban-backed communists versus freedom-loving democracy
- Reality was different: FMLN received minimal external support (some weapons from Nicaragua, limited Cuban training), while US provided massive direct intervention backing oligarchy

Congressional restrictions:

- Some US congressional representatives (particularly Democrats) opposed intervention
- Restrictions required US government to certify El Salvador was improving human rights—administration fabricated reports claiming progress while massacres continued
- Restrictions were ineffective—aid continued regardless of actual conditions

US intervention was decisive. Without US military aid, Salvadoran military would likely have been defeated by mid-1980s. US taxpayers spent $6 billion keeping coffee oligarchy in power.

The War's Dynamics (1980-1992)

Territorial control:

- **FMLN**: Controlled rural areas in northern departments—Chalatenango, Morazán, Cabañas, northern Usulután, parts of San Vicente
- **Government**: Controlled cities, departmental capitals, strategic infrastructure (ports, airports, military bases)
- **Contested**: Large areas of countryside where neither side had permanent control

Fighting patterns:

- Guerrilla warfare: FMLN avoided large-unit battles, using ambushes, raids, and sabotage
- Government sweeps: Military launched operations attempting to clear FMLN zones, often killing civilians suspected of supporting guerrillas
- Urban attacks: FMLN conducted sabotage in cities—blowing up power stations, attacking military facilities
- No clear frontlines: War occurred throughout country with violence erupting unpredictably

Civilian suffering:

- Trapped between sides: Civilians in contested areas faced violence from both FMLN (requiring food and support) and government (suspecting FMLN sympathy)
- Displacement: Approximately 1 million Salvadorans fled (internally displaced or refugees to US, Mexico, Honduras)—20% of population
- Economic destruction: Infrastructure destroyed, agriculture disrupted, economy devastated

Death Squads and Massacres: Systematic Terror

Government forces and death squads killed systematically throughout war, targeting anyone suspected of FMLN support or simply terrorizing populations in contested areas.

Death squad operations:

- Continued from 1980-1981 patterns: kidnapping, torture, murder
- Bodies left publicly: dumped on roadsides, in ravines, in city streets
- Targets: union leaders, teachers, healthcare workers, peasant leaders, clergy, human rights workers
- Scale: 10,000-15,000 killed by death squads 1980-1984; thousands more through rest of war

Major massacres (selected examples):

Río Sumpul massacre (May 14, 1980):

- Salvadoran military and Honduran forces coordinated to trap fleeing civilians at Sumpul River (border with Honduras)
- 600+ civilians killed—men, women, children attempting to cross river to Honduras
- Victims were from Chalatenango department fleeing military operation
- Soldiers shot people in water; survivors were hunted down

El Calabozo massacre (August 22, 1982):

- Atlacatl Battalion (elite US-trained unit) attacked El Calabozo (San Vicente department)
- 200+ civilians killed during military operation
- Village was suspected of supporting FMLN

El Mozote massacre (December 11-13, 1981)—The most infamous:

El Mozote: 1,000+ Civilians Massacred

In December 1981, Salvadoran military launched "Operation Rescue" in Morazán department targeting FMLN strongholds. The operation culminated in El Mozote village massacre—worst single atrocity of Central American wars.

The battalion: Atlacatl Battalion—elite rapid-reaction force of approximately 1,000 soldiers. US-trained at Fort Benning and Fort Bragg, equipped with US weapons, considered Salvadoran military's best unit.

El Mozote: Village in Morazán with approximately 1,000 inhabitants. Residents were conservative evangelical Christians, not FMLN supporters. Village leaders had explicitly chosen neutrality.

December 10-11, 1981: Atlacatl Battalion surrounded El Mozote. Soldiers entered village, rounded up inhabitants, and separated men, women, and children into groups.

The killing (December 11-13):

- **Men**: Executed in groups of ten-fifteen, shot in village center
- **Women and girls**: Locked in houses, raped systematically, then killed
- **Children**: Murdered in church—soldiers shot infants, stabbed children with bayonets, crushed skulls
- **Final phase**: Soldiers burned houses with bodies inside
- **Surrounding villages**: After El Mozote, soldiers moved to nearby hamlets (La Joya, Cerro Pando, others) and repeated massacres

Death toll: Forensic investigations in 1990s confirmed approximately 800-1,000 killed at El Mozote and surrounding hamlets. Some estimates reach 1,200.

Victims: 98-99% were civilians. Children comprised significant percentage—perhaps 500+ children killed.

US response:

- Initial reports (January 1982): Journalists Raymond Bonner (New York Times) and Alma Guillermoprieto (Washington Post) investigated and reported massacre
- Reagan administration denial: US officials claimed reports were "communist propaganda," questioned journalists' credibility, demanded investigations of journalists rather than massacre
- Congressional testimony: Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Enders testified (February 1982) that reports were unverified and probably exaggerated
- US continued military aid to El Salvador without interruption

Later confirmation:

- 1992-1993 UN Truth Commission: Investigated and confirmed massacre, named Atlacatl Battalion, noted US training
- 1990s forensic investigations: Excavations of mass graves confirmed death toll, found bullet casings from US-manufactured ammunition, documented that victims were civilians including children
- 2012 recognition: Salvadoran government officially acknowledged massacre

Pattern: El Mozote was extreme example of counterinsurgency strategy—destroy civilian populations suspected of supporting guerrillas. This was US-taught doctrine implemented by US-trained unit using US weapons and protected by US diplomatic denials.

Casualties and Responsibility (1980-1992)

Total deaths: Approximately 75,000 killed during civil war—1.5% of El Salvador's 5 million population

Responsibility for deaths:

- **Government forces and death squads**: 80-90% of killings
- **FMLN**: 10-15% of killings (primarily combatants, some civilians in crossfire or targeted as government collaborators)

Breakdown:

- Civilians: 50,000-60,000 (vast majority killed by government forces)
- Combatants: 15,000-25,000 (FMLN guerrillas, government soldiers)
- "Disappeared": 8,000+ (kidnapped, never seen again—presumed killed by death squads)

Who was killed:

- Rural peasants (largest category): Suspected of FMLN support or caught in sweeps
- Urban workers and students: Organizing unions or protests
- Clergy and religious workers: Practicing liberation theology
- Teachers and healthcare workers: Working in contested areas
- Human rights workers: Documenting abuses

The pattern was identical to Guatemala's civil war (1960-1996: 200,000 killed, 93% by government) and to 1932 La Matanza. Elite response to threats to land monopoly was genocide—systematic killing of civilian populations to eliminate organizational capacity and terrorize survivors into submission.

VII. Peace Accords and Elite Amnesty (1992)

Stalemate Leading to Negotiations

By 1990, neither side could win militarily:

FMLN's position:

- Controlled rural zones that government couldn't pacify
- Could conduct operations throughout country including San Salvador
- November 1989 "Final Offensive": FMLN forces entered San Salvador, fought in middle-class neighborhoods, demonstrated government couldn't secure capital
- But: Couldn't take cities permanently, couldn't defeat military decisively

Government's position:

- Controlled cities and infrastructure
- Had massive US military aid
- But: Couldn't eliminate FMLN despite twelve years of war and $6 billion US investment
- Rural areas remained contested

International context:

- Cold War ended (1989-1991): US less willing to fund endless counterinsurgency
- Soviet Union collapsed: FMLN lost ideological patron (though FMLN received minimal Soviet support anyway)
- Regional peace process: Central American presidents negotiated Esquipulas Peace Accords (1987) creating framework for ending wars

January 16, 1992: Chapultepec Peace Accords

Negotiations occurred through 1991 mediated by UN, culminating in peace accords signed January 16, 1992, in Chapultepec Castle, Mexico City.

Key provisions:

Military reforms:

- Reduce military by 50% (from approximately 60,000 to 30,000)
- Disband security forces responsible for worst abuses (Treasury Police, National Guard, National Police)
- Purge officers with human rights violations records
- Create new civilian National Civil Police (PNC) with FMLN and government members
- End military draft
- Military subordinate to civilian authority

FMLN disarmament and legalization:

- FMLN disarm and demobilize
- FMLN become legal political party
- FMLN members integrate into new police force

Land reform:

- Land Transfer Program: Distribute land to ex-combatants (both FMLN and military) and landless peasants
- Target: 47,500 families receiving 150,000+ hectares
- Lands would come from government holdings, estates in conflict zones, and voluntary sales

Truth Commission:

- UN-appointed commission to investigate war crimes
- Document atrocities, identify responsible parties
- Recommendations for justice and reconciliation

Judicial reforms:

- Independent judiciary
- Human rights protections
- Constitutional reforms guaranteeing rights

Implementation Betrayed (1992-2000)

The accords looked comprehensive. Implementation was different.

Truth Commission (1993):

- Commission investigated and documented atrocities
- March 1993 report ("From Madness to Hope"): Confirmed death squads, named responsible officers including D'Aubuisson (Romero assassination), documented El Mozote massacre, attributed 85% of violence to government forces
- Conclusions threatened elite and military impunity

Amnesty Law (March 1993):

- Five days after Truth Commission report, Salvadoran legislature (ARENA-controlled) passed general amnesty law
- Amnesty covered all perpetrators—military officers, death squad members, FMLN combatants
- Effect: No prosecutions for war crimes, no accountability, complete impunity for atrocities
- Elite escaped justice entirely

Land reform failure:

- Land Transfer Program initially promising: Some land distributed to ex-combatants
- Problems emerged:
    - Only 47,000 hectares distributed (not 150,000+ promised)
    - Land was often marginal—poor soil, no water, unsuitable for agriculture
    - Beneficiaries received no credit, technical assistance, or equipment

    - Many couldn't make mortgage payments (land wasn't free—it required payments to government)
    - Recipients lost land or couldn't make it productive
- Oligarchy retained vast majority of best land
- By 2000, land concentration was barely changed from 1980

Military reforms partially implemented:

- Size reduced but officer corps remained largely intact
- Some human rights violators purged but many remained in military or moved to private security
- New police force (PNC) created but plagued by corruption
- Military retained significant political influence

Why implementation failed:

- ARENA controlled government (Alfredo Cristiani president 1989-1994)
- Oligarchy controlled ARENA
- Elite had no interest in genuine land redistribution or accountability
- FMLN was militarily weakened after disarmament—couldn't force compliance
- International community didn't pressure for full implementation
- US supported elite interests

The pattern: Like Guatemala's Peace Accords (1996), El Salvador's accords were negotiated compromises that looked progressive on paper but were betrayed in implementation. Elite signed to end war and international pressure, then blocked provisions threatening their wealth and power.

VIII. Synthesis: 1932-1992—Sixty Years, Same Pattern

The sixty years from La Matanza to Peace Accords demonstrated:

Military-oligarchy alliance: Military ruled openly 1932-1992 but served oligarchy interests. Officers accumulated wealth through land grants, business partnerships, and corruption. Oligarchy financed military and allowed governance autonomy. Both protected land monopoly.

Cyclical violence protecting property:

- 1932: 30,000 killed suppressing peasant uprising and indigenous organizing
- 1980-1992: 75,000 killed preventing land reform
- Pattern: Elite uses genocide (1932) or mass killing (1980-1992) whenever land monopoly is threatened

US backing both times:

- 1932: Implicit approval (recognition, continued trade, no sanctions)
- 1980-1992: Explicit massive intervention ($6 billion, military training, diplomatic cover)
- US consistently backed oligarchy against reform

Elite impunity both times:

- 1932: Martínez celebrated as hero, no accountability for massacre
- 1992-1993: General amnesty, no prosecutions, perpetrators protected
- Pattern: Elite never faces consequences for atrocities

Land monopoly unchanged:

- 1932: 2% owned 60-70% of land
- 1992: 2% owned 60% of land
- Despite revolution, war, peace accords, land concentration was unchanged

Same families in control:

- Coffee oligarchy of 1930s (Dueñas, Hill, Meléndez, Regalado, etc.)
- Diversified oligarchy of 1990s (same families now controlling coffee, banking, industry, commerce)
- ARENA party (1980-2009) was oligarchy's political vehicle
- Genealogical continuity: Same family names 1880s-1990s

The lesson 1932 taught—organizing for land reform equals death—was confirmed 1980-1992. Anyone challenging land monopoly would be killed. The war killed 75,000 proving elite would commit any violence necessary to preserve property.

Part 4 examines whether formal democracy (1992-2025) changed fundamental architecture or provided new facade for oligarchy rule—and whether Bukele's authoritarian populism (2019-2025) represents change or continuation of same patterns protecting elite wealth.

END PART 3

Continue to Part 4: Neoliberalism and Bukele's Authoritarian Turn (1992-2025)

The "Fourteen Families": Five Hundred Years of Oligarchic Control in Central America's Smallest Republic

El Salvador 1524-2025: A Case Study in Concentrated Elite Power and Cyclical Violence

Part 4 of 4: Neoliberalism and Bukele's Authoritarian Turn (1992-2025)

I. ARENA Dominance: Oligarchy's Political Control (1992-2009)

ARENA: Making Oligarchy Explicit

From 1992 to 2009, ARENA (Nationalist Republican Alliance) controlled El Salvador's presidency continuously—winning four consecutive elections. This represented direct oligarchy rule through democratic mechanisms rather than military intermediaries. The "Fourteen Families" governed openly through their political party.

ARENA presidents (1989-2009):

Alfredo Cristiani (1989-1994): Coffee oligarch from Cristiani family. Cristiani family owned coffee estates and pharmaceutical companies. Alfredo Cristiani negotiated Peace Accords (1992) ensuring they protected elite interests. During his presidency, general amnesty was passed, land reform was minimized, and oligarchy's wealth was secured.

Armando Calderón Sol (1994-1999): ARENA hardliner. Continued neoliberal policies privatizing state enterprises and implementing free trade. Consolidated ARENA's political dominance while serving business elite through ANEP coordination.

Francisco Flores (1999-2004): US-educated technocrat. Implemented dollarization (2001) eliminating Salvadoran currency in favor of US dollar. This benefited elite's dollar-denominated assets and international transactions while removing monetary policy tools that could have been used for redistribution. Flores later faced corruption charges (died before trial).

Elías Antonio Saca (2004-2009): Media businessman with connections to elite networks. Continued neoliberal policies and free trade expansion. Later convicted of corruption (embezzlement of $300+ million), demonstrating pervasive elite/government corruption.

The pattern: ARENA was oligarchy's party. Presidents either came from core elite families (Cristiani) or were businessmen allied with elite (Saca). Policies consistently favored wealth concentration while using democratic legitimacy to maintain domestic and international acceptability.

Neoliberal Policies Enriching Elite (1992-2009)

ARENA governments implemented comprehensive neoliberal reforms transferring public wealth to private elite ownership:

Privatization (1990s-2000s):

Banking sector: Before 1990s, banking was partially nationalized (1980 junta nationalized banks attempting to break elite financial control). ARENA re-privatized banks in 1990s. Elite families purchased banks at favorable prices:

- Dueñas, Gutiérrez, and other core families acquired controlling shares
- By 2000s, approximately 5 families controlled 70-80% of banking assets
- Banks charged high interest rates to poor (15-25%) while providing cheap credit to elite businesses (5-10%)
- Banking concentration allowed elite to control capital allocation economy-wide

Telecommunications: State telephone company (ANTEL) privatized. Elite-connected investors and foreign companies purchased at discount. Service remained expensive for poor while profits flowed to private owners.

Electricity distribution: Electricity generation and distribution partially privatized. Elite families and foreign companies purchased distribution companies. Poor consumers paid high rates; elite benefited from guaranteed returns.

Pensions: Social Security pension system partially privatized creating private pension funds (AFPs). Elite financial firms managed AFPs, collecting fees from workers' contributions. When global financial crisis (2008) destroyed pension values, workers lost retirement savings while managers kept fees.

The pattern across privatizations: Public assets built with tax revenues (largely consumption taxes hitting poor) were sold at favorable prices to elite buyers. Services became more expensive for poor consumers. Elite accumulated wealth through monopoly or oligopoly control of essential services.

Tax policy favoring wealth:

El Salvador maintained one of Latin America's most regressive tax systems:

- **Low income taxes**: Personal income tax rates were low (maximum 30%, but effective rates much lower due to exemptions and evasion)

- **Capital gains untaxed**: Wealth accumulated through investments faced minimal taxation
- **Elite tax evasion**: Wealthy systematically evaded taxes through offshore accounts, transfer pricing, and legal loopholes. Government lacked capacity or will to enforce tax laws against elite.
- **Regressive consumption taxes**: Most revenue came from VAT (value-added tax) and other consumption taxes hitting poor hardest. Poor spent higher percentage of income on taxed goods.

Result: Government chronically underfunded. Social services were minimal. Infrastructure was inadequate. But elite paid little tax on accumulated wealth.

Dollarization (January 1, 2001):

President Flores eliminated Salvadoran colón, adopting US dollar as official currency. Rationale presented:

- Eliminate inflation (colón had experienced periodic inflation)
- Attract foreign investment (dollar-denominated economy was "stable")
- Facilitate remittances (Salvadorans in US could send dollars directly)
- Integrate with US economy (CAFTA free trade agreement was being negotiated)

Reality—who benefited:

Elite winners:

- Elite's dollar-denominated assets (bank accounts, investments in US) were protected
- Importers (elite-owned companies) benefited from stable currency
- Financial sector benefited from remittances flowing through banks
- Exporters had predictable currency for international transactions

Poor losers:

- Lost monetary policy tools: Government couldn't adjust currency to protect domestic producers or workers
- Prices rose: Many goods became more expensive when converted to dollars
- Small producers: Couldn't compete with US imports flooding market due to overvalued currency
- Wages stagnant: Dollar wages didn't rise while dollar prices did

Dollarization was wealth transfer—eliminating policy tools that could redistribute while protecting elite's assets.

CAFTA-DR (2004): Central America Free Trade Agreement with United States

Elite benefits:

- Elite exporters accessed US markets without tariffs
- Elite importers brought US goods without restrictions
- Foreign investors (often partnering with domestic elite) entered Salvadoran market

Costs:

- Small Salvadoran producers couldn't compete with US subsidized agriculture
- Manufacturing declined further (couldn't compete with US factories)
- Agriculture destroyed: US corn, rice, beans undersold Salvadoran producers
- Remaining small farmers pushed off land or into extreme poverty

CAFTA accelerated deindustrialization and agricultural collapse, forcing more Salvadorans into emigration or maquila labor.

II. Maquila Exploitation and Remittance Dependency (1992-2025)

The Maquila Model: Super-Exploitation

Starting 1990s, hundreds of maquilas (assembly plants) were established in El Salvador's Free Trade Zones. The model:

Structure:

- Foreign companies (Korean, Taiwanese, US) owned factories
- Elite Salvadoran families often owned industrial parks and buildings leased to maquilas
- Plants imported fabric, components, and machinery duty-free
- Workers assembled products (primarily textiles—shirts, pants, underwear)
- Finished products exported to US duty-free

Conditions:

Wages: $200-300 monthly in 2000s-2010s—barely subsistence for family. Workers earned approximately $1.50-2.00 per hour when living wage was $3-4 per hour.

Hours: 10-12 hour shifts, 6 days per week. Mandatory overtime was routine. Workers who refused overtime were fired.

Quotas: Workers had production quotas (e.g., 1,000 garments per shift). Missing quotas meant wage penalties or termination. Quotas increased continuously—workers had to work faster each year for same pay.

Health and safety: Poor ventilation, inadequate lighting, few bathroom breaks (some factories limited breaks to twice per 12-hour shift), repetitive stress injuries widespread, exposure to chemicals without protection.

Labor rights suppressed: Unions were officially legal but organizing was nearly impossible. Employers fired organizers. Government didn't enforce labor laws. Independent unions faced violence. Only company-controlled unions were tolerated.

Who benefited:

Foreign companies: Profited from super-cheap labor and tax exemptions

Elite families: Owned real estate leased to maquilas, collected rents, paid minimal taxes through Free Trade Zone exemptions

Government: Claimed maquilas created "jobs" and "development"—but jobs were poverty wages and development was minimal (most profits left country)

Workers: Had option of maquila poverty wages versus unemployment/starvation

The maquila model was continuation of historical extraction—coerced labor producing wealth for elite. Mechanisms changed (debt peonage became wage labor, but wages were below subsistence), but pattern was identical.

Remittances: Exporting Labor, Importing Dollars

Unable to survive in El Salvador, 2+ million Salvadorans emigrated between 1980-2025—primarily to United States. By 2020s, approximately 1.5-2 million Salvadorans lived in US (compared to 6.5 million in El Salvador).

Push factors:

- Landlessness: No access to land for subsistence
- Unemployment: Formal economy couldn't employ majority
- Poverty wages: Maquila and agricultural wages insufficient for survival
- Violence: Gang violence (discussed below) made communities unlivable
- Climate change: Droughts and crop failures increased in 2010s

Remittances scale:

- 1992: $800 million annually (approximately 10% GDP)
- 2000: $1.8 billion (13% GDP)
- 2010: $3.5 billion (16% GDP)
- 2020: $5.9 billion (23% GDP)
- 2024: $7-8 billion (24-25% GDP)

By 2020s, remittances were largest source of foreign exchange—larger than all exports combined. Approximately 25% of Salvadoran families received remittances regularly.

Who benefited:

Families: Remittances kept families alive. Money paid for food, school, healthcare, housing. Without remittances, many families would starve. Remittances were survival mechanism.

Elite: Remittances flowed through elite-controlled banks (charging transfer fees). Remittances were spent at elite-owned stores, supermarkets, and businesses. Elite captured substantial portion of remittance income indirectly.

Government: Remittances stabilized economy. Dollarization meant remittance dollars entered directly without currency exchange. Government didn't have to provide employment or services—emigration/remittances were substitute social policy.

US employers: Benefited from cheap immigrant labor while El Salvador bore costs of raising/educating workers

Pattern recognition: Remittances represented extraction system's evolution. Elite's land monopoly couldn't provide subsistence, so workers emigrated. Workers sent money back keeping families alive while elite captured portion through financial services and retail. This was more sophisticated than 1932 mandamiento but functionally similar—elite extracted wealth from coerced labor (immigration under desperation was coercion).

The system was completely unsustainable as social policy but perfectly functional for elite—remittances kept population from revolting while elite maintained wealth concentration without having to provide employment or services.

III. FMLN in Power: Social Democracy Blocked (2009-2019)

2009 Election: Historic FMLN Victory

In March 2009, Mauricio Funes won presidency for FMLN—first left-wing president in Salvadoran history. The victory represented enormous hope for poor majority:

Funes: Journalist and TV personality, not former guerrilla commander. FMLN selected Funes as candidate specifically because he wasn't associated with armed struggle—he was moderate face acceptable to middle class and international community.

Campaign promises:

- Expand education (free uniforms, school meals, supplies)
- Improve healthcare (build clinics in poor communities)
- Social programs for poor (pensions for elderly, programs for disabled)
- Progressive taxation (asking wealthy to pay fair share)
- Reduce violence (gang prevention programs)

Electoral victory: Funes won 51% vs. ARENA's 49%—narrow victory but historic. For first time, FMLN would control presidency. Possibility of change seemed real.

Elite response: Panic. FMLN meant communism meant land redistribution meant their wealth threatened. Elite prepared to resist.

Funes Administration (2009-2014): Modest Reforms, Elite Resistance

Funes implemented social programs benefiting poor:

Education programs:

- Free school uniforms for all public school students
- School meal programs feeding approximately 1 million children daily
- Free school supplies
- Literacy programs for adults

Healthcare expansion:

- Built clinics in poor urban and rural communities
- Provided free medications for chronic diseases
- Expanded vaccination programs

Social pensions: Small monthly payments to elderly poor who had never received formal pensions

Infrastructure: Improved roads, water systems in poor communities

These programs cost money. Funes proposed modest tax increases on wealthy and corporations to fund social spending.

Elite resistance:

ARENA-controlled legislature: ARENA held legislative majority (or close to it) throughout Funes presidency. They blocked budgets, refused tax increases, obstructed appointments.

ANEP opposition: Business lobby organized campaigns claiming tax increases would "destroy economy," "drive away investment," "create unemployment." Elite-owned media amplified these messages.

Capital strike threats: Elite threatened to move money out of country, close businesses, lay off workers if taxes increased. These threats were credible because elite controlled investment decisions.

Court challenges: Elite used courts (many judges were conservative holdovers) to block policies on constitutional grounds.

Media attacks: Elite-owned media (majority of Salvadoran media) attacked Funes constantly—portraying him as incompetent, corrupt, secretly radical, Venezuelan puppet.

Result: Funes implemented social programs that helped poor but couldn't fundamentally challenge elite power. Programs were funded through borrowing and creative accounting rather than progressive taxation. Land ownership was unchanged. Wealth concentration continued. Elite maintained economic dominance.

Funes also compromised heavily. He appointed conservatives to cabinet positions. He maintained friendly relations with US government. He didn't attempt nationalizations or radical redistribution. His policies were social democratic reform, not revolution—but even that was too much for elite.

Salvador Sánchez Cerén (2014-2019): More Radical, More Resistance

In 2014, Salvador Sánchez Cerén won presidency for FMLN. Sánchez Cerén was different from Funes:

Background: Former guerrilla commander (nom de guerre "Leonel González"), schoolteacher before joining FMLN, survived civil war and peace accords, served as Funes's vice president.

Ideology: More leftist than Funes, more committed to structural change, less willing to compromise with elite.

Goals: Continue and expand social programs, pursue corruption prosecutions, challenge oligarchy more directly.

Elite response: Intensified resistance. If Funes scared them, Sánchez Cerén terrified them.

Problems during Sánchez Cerén presidency:

Economic stagnation: Growth was slow (1-2% annually). Remittances kept economy afloat but formal sector wasn't creating jobs. Elite blamed FMLN policies; reality was structural—maquila model and remittance dependency couldn't generate sustained growth.

Corruption scandals: Some FMLN officials were caught in corruption—embezzlement, taking bribes, misusing funds. These scandals damaged FMLN's credibility. Elite media amplified scandals suggesting "FMLN was as corrupt as ARENA."

Gang violence crisis: Homicide rates were catastrophic—50-100 murders per 100,000 annually (among world's highest). Gangs (Mara Salvatrucha/MS-13 and Barrio 18) controlled neighborhoods, extorted businesses and residents, killed rivals and civilians. Violence made daily life terrifying.

Legislative obstruction: ARENA and other opposition parties blocked Sánchez Cerén's initiatives systematically.

Why FMLN Failed to Transform El Salvador:

FMLN won elections but didn't control economy. Elite controlled:

- Banking and finance (capital allocation)
- Media (shaping public opinion)
- Legislature (blocking reforms)
- Courts (challenging laws)
- Investment decisions (capital flight threats)

FMLN could implement social programs but couldn't:

- Redistribute land (elite ownership was untouchable)
- Tax wealth progressively (elite blocked tax reforms)
- Nationalize key industries (elite and US would resist)
- Break oligarchy power (elite controlled too many institutions)

The pattern was identical to Guatemala's Arévalo and Árbenz (1945-1954): Electoral victory without dismantling elite power meant reforms would be blocked. FMLN learned what Árbenz learned—you can't reform your way past oligarchy that controls economy.

By 2019, FMLN was unpopular. Social programs helped but weren't enough. Violence was intolerable. Economic stagnation frustrated everyone. Corruption scandals damaged credibility. FMLN had governed for 10 years without transforming El Salvador fundamentally. Voters were disillusioned.

IV. Nayib Bukele: Authoritarian Populism (2019-2025)

Bukele's Rise: The Outsider Who Wasn't

Nayib Bukele won presidency in February 2019 as outsider attacking traditional parties:

Background:

- Born 1981 to Palestinian-Salvadoran business family (father owned advertising agency)

- Businessman running advertising/marketing companies
- Mayor of Nuevo Cuscatlán (2012-2015), then San Salvador (2015-2018)
- Left FMLN in 2017 after internal conflicts, formed new party

2019 campaign:

- Attacked both ARENA and FMLN as corrupt, incompetent, same old elite
- Promised to "break the mold," end corruption, reduce violence
- Social media-savvy: Used Twitter, Facebook, Instagram extensively
- Young, charismatic, new face
- Slogan: "There's enough money when nobody steals"

Electoral victory: Won 53% (ARENA 32%, FMLN 14%)—decisive victory rejecting traditional parties.

Base: Urban middle class, youth (voting for first time), and working class frustrated with FMLN's failures.

Bukele positioned himself as revolutionary change agent. Reality was different.

Bukele's Governing Style (2019-2025): Authoritarian Consolidation

Personalist autocracy:

- Concentrated power in presidency
- Sidelined institutions (congress, courts, checks and balances)
- Governed through Twitter—announced policies, attacked critics, shaped narratives through social media
- Created cult of personality—"world's coolest dictator" (Bukele's self-description)

February 9, 2020—Legislative occupation:

- Bukele wanted legislature to approve loan for security equipment
- Legislature delayed vote
- Bukele ordered military and police to occupy Legislative Assembly
- Soldiers with assault rifles entered chamber while Bukele sat in speaker's chair
- Clear threat: Pass what I want or face military force
- Legislature eventually complied

2021 Constitutional Court coup:

- May 2021: Bukele's party (New Ideas) won legislative supermajority in March elections
- Bukele's legislators illegally removed Supreme Court judges and Attorney General
- Installed loyalists in their places
- Constitutional Court subsequently ruled Bukele could run for immediate reelection (Constitution prohibited this)

Democratic breakdown: By 2022, Bukele controlled all branches of government. Opposition parties were marginalized. Independent judges were removed. Checks on presidential power were eliminated.

International criticism: US, EU, Organization of American States criticized Bukele's authoritarian moves. Bukele dismissed criticism, claiming he represented "people's will" against "corrupt elite."

Bitcoin Experiment (September 2021): Publicity Stunt

On September 7, 2021, El Salvador became first country to adopt Bitcoin as legal tender.

Bukele's rationale:

- "Financial inclusion"—poor Salvadorans without bank accounts could use Bitcoin
- Reduce remittance fees—Salvadorans could send Bitcoin instead of dollars
- Attract crypto investment and tourism
- Modernize El Salvador's image

Reality:

Implementation failure: Government created Chivo digital wallet app. Launch was disastrous—app crashed, servers couldn't handle traffic, many transactions failed. Government gave every citizen $30 in Bitcoin to encourage adoption—cost government $135 million; much of it was immediately cashed out.

Popular rejection: Most Salvadorans ignored Bitcoin. Too volatile (price fluctuated wildly), too complicated (required smartphone and internet), unnecessary (dollar worked fine). Businesses required by law to accept Bitcoin mostly converted immediately to dollars.

Government losses: Bukele purchased Bitcoin with government funds at various prices. When Bitcoin crashed (2022), government lost tens of millions of dollars on speculative investments.

Who benefited:

- Crypto enthusiasts and investors internationally—publicity for Bitcoin
- Some wealthy Salvadorans and foreigners who speculated
- Almost no benefit to poor majority

Pattern: Bitcoin was spectacle—making Bukele look innovative and attracting international attention while providing zero benefit to poor. It was extraction of different kind—using government resources for vanity project while poor remained impoverished.

"State of Exception" and Mass Incarceration (March 2022-Present)

This is Bukele's defining policy and most important for understanding his relationship with elite.

Context: Weekend of March 25-27, 2022, saw spike in homicides—87 people killed (approximately 30 per day, high even for violent El Salvador). Gangs were blamed.

Bukele's response: March 27, 2022, Bukele requested and legislature immediately approved "estado de excepción" (state of exception)—emergency measures suspending constitutional rights.

Suspended rights:

- Right to legal defense (no lawyers)
- Right to be informed of charges
- Presumption of innocence
- Protection from arbitrary detention
- Limits on detention without charges (detainees held indefinitely)
- Freedom of association

Authorization: Police and military could arrest anyone without warrant based on suspicion of gang membership.

Mass arrests (2022-2025):

Scale: Over 100,000 arrested (approximately 75,000-100,000 in custody at any time). In country of 6.5 million, this is 1.5% of population imprisoned under state of exception.

Targeting:

- Young men (ages 15-40) from poor neighborhoods
- Anyone with tattoos (assumed gang markers)
- Anyone in "wrong" neighborhood when police arrived
- Arbitrary: Many innocent people arrested based on appearance or location

Process:

- Mass trials: Hundreds tried simultaneously in same courtroom
- No individual defense
- Convictions based on police testimony, tattoos, or simply being arrested
- Sentences: 20-40 years for "illicit association" (gang membership)

Conditions:

CECOT (Centro de Confinamiento del Terrorismo): Mega-prison opened February 2023 holding 40,000 inmates (largest prison in Americas). Conditions:

- Extreme overcrowding: Inmates packed into cells
- No sunlight: Prison designed to prevent light exposure
- Minimal food: Reports of 2 meals daily, insufficient calories

- No family visits
- No rehabilitation programs
- Torture documented: Human rights organizations documented beatings, denial of medical care, deaths from abuse

Deaths in custody: Over 200 documented deaths in custody 2022-2024. Causes: beatings, medical neglect, torture. Government denied responsibility.

Innocence: Human rights organizations estimated 10-15% of detained were innocent—arrested arbitrarily, not gang members. No process for appeal or release.

Violence reduction: Homicide rate dropped dramatically—from 50-100 per 100,000 to approximately 2-3 per 100,000 by 2024. El Salvador went from one of world's most violent countries to one of safest statistically.

Popular support: Bukele's approval rating increased to 85-90%. Most Salvadorans supported state of exception despite human rights violations. After decades of gang terror, safety was worth the cost.

Elite and Bukele: Accommodation and Continuity

Critical question: How does Bukele relate to oligarchy?

Bukele's attacks on political elite: Bukele attacked ARENA and FMLN politicians, prosecuted some for corruption, portrayed himself as enemy of "old elite."

But Bukele didn't attack economic elite:

No land redistribution: Never discussed, never attempted

No progressive taxation: Bukele didn't increase taxes on wealthy. He eliminated some taxes (property transfer tax) benefiting real estate investors.

No nationalizations: Private control of banking, industry, commerce continued

Business-friendly policies: Bukele courted foreign investment, promoted El Salvador as business destination, maintained neoliberal economic policies

Elite accommodation: ANEP (business lobby) was initially cautious about Bukele but accommodated him. Elite families maintained wealth. Bukele's policies didn't threaten property.

Mass incarceration served elite: State of exception targeted poor young men—same class that had organized in 1932 and 1980s. Imprisoning 100,000 poor men eliminated potential organizing base.

Pattern recognition: Like military dictators (1932-1992), Bukele is authoritarian but doesn't threaten elite wealth. He attacks political opposition and imprisons poor, but leaves property relations unchanged. Elite tolerate (even support) Bukele because he maintains their wealth while providing "security" (eliminating potentially threatening poor population).

Bukele's regime demonstrates that authoritarianism protecting elite interests can enjoy popular support if it provides perceived benefits (violence reduction) and scapegoats (gangs, corrupt politicians) while leaving wealth concentration untouched.

2024 Reelection: Constitutional Crisis

Constitution prohibited immediate presidential reelection. Bukele's loyalist Supreme Court ruled (2021) that he could run anyway.

February 2024 election: Bukele won reelection with approximately 85% of vote—massive victory. Opposition was demolished. ARENA received less than 7%. FMLN received less than 2%.

Implications: Bukele now controls presidency, legislature (2/3 supermajority), judiciary, military, and police. Opposition is nonexistent. Checks on power are eliminated. El Salvador is effectively autocracy with democratic facade.

Elite response: Accepted. As long as Bukele doesn't threaten property, elite can accommodate his authoritarianism. Pattern is clear—regime form doesn't matter if wealth distribution is unchanged.

V. Contemporary Elite Structure (2025)

The "Fourteen Families" in 2025: Same Families, Same Control

The families dominating El Salvador in 2025 are same families (or their descendants) from 1880s coffee boom:

Banking and finance:

- Elite consortium controls majority of banking assets
- Dueñas, Gutiérrez, and other families maintain ownership stakes
- Banking concentration allows control of capital allocation economy-wide

Agribusiness:

- Coffee: Declined from peak but core families still produce
- Sugar: Multiple elite families control sugar production (Pacific coast estates)

- African palm oil: Elite families control plantations in Izabal-like regions

Retail and commerce:

- Meza-Ayau family: Super Selectos supermarket chain dominates retail
- Multiple families: Import-export companies, wholesale distribution
- Calleja family: Retail operations

Industry:

- Cement, beverages, food processing remain oligopolistic
- Same families from 20th century maintain control or sold to international companies (capturing sale value)

Real estate:

- Elite families own prime urban real estate in San Salvador
- Control land around expanding cities
- Industrial parks leased to maquilas

Media:

- Majority of media outlets owned or controlled by elite families or aligned business interests
- Media shapes narratives favoring elite interests

Cross-ownership and intermarriage: Elite families remain extensively intermarried. The "Fourteen Families" aren't 14 separate entities—they're one extended kinship and business network.

Genealogical continuity: Documented lineages:

- **Dueñas**: Present in colonial records (1600s-1700s indigo), coffee oligarchy (1880s-1920s), banking/finance (1990s-2025)
- **Hill**: Arrived 1700s, coffee fortunes (1880s-1920s), banking (1990s-2025)
- **Cristiani**: Coffee (1880s-1920s), pharmaceuticals/diversification (1950s-2025), produced president (1989-1994)
- **Meza-Ayau**: Coffee (1880s-1920s), supermarkets/retail (1960s-2025)
- **Salaverría**: Coffee (1880s-1920s), diversified (1950s-2025)

These families appear across 140+ years of documented records. Some trace further to colonial indigo oligarchy.

ANEP: Coordinating Elite Interests (2025)

ANEP (established 1966) remains powerful business lobby:

- Coordinates elite economic interests
- Lobbies government for favorable policies
- Organizes opposition to policies threatening elite
- Maintains unified elite voice

ANEP accommodated Bukele after initial caution. As long as Bukele maintains business-friendly policies, ANEP supports his government.

Land Concentration: Unchanged After 500 Years

Contemporary statistics (2020s):

- Gini coefficient: 0.40-0.52 (among Latin America's worst)
- Top 10% control approximately 80% of wealth
- Land concentration: 2% own 60%+ of arable land
- Income inequality: Top 20% earn 50%+ of income

Historical comparison:

- 1600: 2-3% owned 80%+ of land
- 1900: 2% owned 60-70% of land
- 1980: 2% owned 60% of land
- 2020: 2% own 60%+ of land

Five hundred years, identical concentration. Colony → Republic → Liberal reforms → Coffee boom → Civil war → Peace accords → Democracy → Bukele authoritarianism—across all these changes, land ownership didn't change.

VI. Synthesis: Five Hundred Years of the Same Pattern

The Core Mechanism: Land Monopoly Through Violence

From 1524 to 2025, El Salvador demonstrates that concentrated elite power persists across regime types when fundamental property relations remain unchanged:

1524-1821 (Colonial):

- 2-3% (Spanish/Creole) owned 80% of land
- Encomienda/repartimiento forced labor
- Indigenous population reduced 90-95%
- Violence: Conquest, suppression of resistance, indigo labor deaths

1821-1932 (Independence and Coffee):

- 2% owned 60-70% of land
- 1881-1882 seizures: 40-60% of remaining indigenous lands stolen
- Mandamiento/debt peonage/vagrancy laws—forced labor continuing
- Violence: 1932 La Matanza—30,000 killed suppressing organizing

1932-1992 (Military Dictatorship and Civil War):

- 2% owned 60% of land
- Military ruled serving oligarchy
- Violence: 1980-1992 civil war—75,000 killed preventing land reform
- US backing: $6 billion ensuring oligarchy's survival

1992-2009 (ARENA Democracy):

- 2% owned 60% of land
- Neoliberalism: Privatization enriching elite
- Maquila/remittances: Extracting labor under new forms
- Violence: Gang violence (consequence of landlessness/poverty)

2009-2019 (FMLN):

- 2% owned 60% of land
- Electoral left couldn't redistribute land
- Elite blocked reforms through institutional control
- Violence: Gang crisis continuing

2019-2025 (Bukele Authoritarianism):

- 2% own 60% of land
- Authoritarian populism attacking political elite but not economic elite
- Violence: Mass incarceration—100,000+ imprisoned, targeting poor
- Pattern: New regime form, same property relations

The "Fourteen Families": 500-Year Genealogy

The families controlling El Salvador today are literally descended from families receiving colonial land grants:

Colonial period (1524-1821):

- Conquistadores received encomiendas
- Indigo oligarchy enriched through forced labor
- Key families documented: Dueñas, Araujo, Regalado (others harder to trace)

Coffee oligarchy (1880s-1932):

- Same families transitioned indigo → coffee
- "Fourteen Families" emerged as explicit brand
- Families documented: Dueñas, Hill, Meléndez, Quiñónez, Regalado, Araujo, Cristiani, Dalton, Guirola, Meza-Ayau, Salaverría, Sol Millet, and others

20th century diversification (1932-1992):

- Same families diversified coffee → banking/industry/commerce
- Military-oligarchy alliance protected wealth
- Families maintained control across regime changes

Contemporary period (1992-2025):

- Same families control banking, agribusiness, retail, industry
- ARENA (1980-2009) was their political party
- Bukele (2019-2025) accommodates them despite anti-elite rhetoric
- Genealogical continuity: Dueñas, Hill, Cristiani, Meza-Ayau documented 1880s-2025

This isn't theoretical—it's empirical. The same surnames appear in colonial records, 19th century coffee documents, 20th century business registries, and 21st century ownership data.

Violence as Permanent Feature: Three Cycles

Elite uses violence cyclically whenever land monopoly is threatened:

1932 La Matanza: 30,000 killed in two weeks

- Trigger: Indigenous/peasant organizing threatening land monopoly
- Response: Genocide eliminating organizing capacity
- Result: 50 years of silence

1980-1992 Civil War: 75,000 killed over 12 years

- Trigger: Land reform demands, guerrilla movement
- Response: Systematic killing, death squads, US-backed counterinsurgency
- Result: Elite amnesty, minimal land redistribution

2022-2025 Mass Incarceration: 100,000+ imprisoned

- Trigger: Not land reform directly but "security"
- Function: Eliminating potentially threatening poor population
- Result: Elite wealth protected, poor immobilized

The pattern: When organizing threatens property, elite responds with overwhelming violence. The violence is systematic, not excessive—it's carefully calibrated to destroy organizing capacity while maintaining extraction.

US Support: Continuous Across Regime Types

United States backed El Salvador's oligarchy continuously:

1932: Implicit support (recognition, no sanctions for massacre)

1944-1979: Support for military dictatorships (anti-communist allies)

1980-1992: Massive intervention ($6 billion, training, weapons, diplomatic cover)

1992-2009: Support for ARENA (neoliberal ally, free trade partner)

2009-2019: Cautious relationship with FMLN (tolerated because FMLN didn't threaten property fundamentally)

2019-2025: Complex relationship with Bukele (criticism of authoritarianism, but acceptance because he maintains property relations and fights gangs)

US consistently prioritized anti-communism and property protection over democracy or human rights. When forced to choose between elite wealth and democratic reform, US chose elite wealth every time.

The 2025 Test: Bukele Proves the Pattern

Bukele's presidency (2019-2025) is real-time test of framework. Does authoritarian populism attacking "political elite" change fundamental extraction if economic elite's property is untouched?

Answer: No.

- Land concentration: Unchanged (2% own 60%+)
- Wealth distribution: Unchanged (top 10% own 80%)
- Elite families: Same families controlling economy
- Violence: Continues but now state-directed (mass incarceration) rather than gang-directed
- Extraction: Continues through maquila, remittances, oligopolistic pricing

Bukele attacked ARENA and FMLN politicians but left oligarchy's wealth alone. He imprisoned 100,000 poor men but didn't redistribute elite estates. He violated democratic norms but maintained property relations.

Elite accommodated Bukele because he serves their interests. Mass incarceration eliminates potentially threatening class. Authoritarianism provides "stability" for business. Bitcoin spectacle changes nothing fundamental.

The test confirms: Political sovereignty transfers (colony → republic → dictatorship → democracy → authoritarianism) are irrelevant when property distribution is unchanged. As long as 2% owns 60%, regime form doesn't matter.

VII. Conclusion: The Proof is Complete

El Salvador demonstrates that concentrated elite power operates identically across five centuries and every regime type. The mechanism is simple:

Land monopoly → Small elite owns majority of productive land
Labor coercion → Landless majority forced to work for elite (encomienda → mandamiento → debt peonage → wage labor → maquila/emigration)
Violence → Any challenge to land monopoly met with overwhelming violence (conquest → La Matanza → civil war → mass incarceration)
Narrative control → Justifying extraction (Catholic civilization → liberal progress → anti-communism → security/stability)
State capture → Elite controls government ensuring property protection regardless of regime type
Genealogical continuity → Same families across centuries

The pattern proves:

1. **Regime type doesn't matter**: Colony, republic, military dictatorship, democracy, authoritarian populism—all preserve elite wealth when property relations unchanged

2. **Violence is permanent**: Not aberrational but structural—required to maintain land monopoly against numerical majority

3. **Elite adapt**: Flags change, rhetoric changes, labor systems modernize—but extraction continues

4. **External backing matters**: US consistently supported oligarchy, providing crucial military/economic aid preventing revolution

5. **Electoral politics can't redistribute**: FMLN won elections but couldn't break elite power without controlling economy

6. **Geography intensifies pattern**: El Salvador's smaller size (vs. Guatemala) produced higher elite concentration and more frequent violence

The specific families are documented: Dueñas, Hill, Cristiani, Meza-Ayau, Salaverría—same surnames 1700s to 2025. This isn't theoretical. It's empirical genealogy proving 500-year continuity.

El Salvador is Guatemala compressed: Same conquest, same mechanisms, same families, same violence—but in 1/5 the territory, producing even more concentrated elite power and even more frequent violence cycles.

The 2025 reality: The families that received Spanish land grants in 1524, enriched themselves through indigo slavery in 1700s, stole indigenous lands for coffee in 1882, conducted La Matanza in 1932, fought US-backed civil war in 1980s, privatized state assets in 1990s—these same families control El Salvador's banking, agribusiness, retail, and land in 2025.

They survived conquest violence, independence, Liberal reforms, military dictatorships, revolution, peace accords, democracy, and authoritarian populism. They survived because one thing never changed: They owned the land. And in agricultural economy, land ownership is power.

As long as 2% owns 60-70%, everything else—constitutions, elections, presidents, rhetoric—is adjustable details. The pattern holds for 500 years because property holds.

El Salvador proves the framework conclusively.

COMPREHENSIVE THEMATIC BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. GENERAL FRAMEWORKS AND COMPARATIVE STUDIES

Elite Theory and Oligarchy

Lungo Uclés, Mario, and Víctor Antonio Orellana. *El Salvador en los años 80: Counterinsurgency and Revolution*. Temple University Press, 1996.

Paige, Jeffery M. *Coffee and Power: Revolution and the Rise of Democracy in Central America*. Harvard University Press, 1997.

- Essential comparative study of Central American coffee oligarchies

Mahoney, James. *The Legacies of Liberalism: Path Dependence and Political Regimes in Central America*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Baloyra-Herp, Enrique A. *El Salvador in Transition*. University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

Land and Agrarian Political Economy

Browning, David. *El Salvador: Landscape and Society*. Clarendon Press, 1971.

- Classic study of land tenure and geography

Durham, William H. *Scarcity and Survival in Central America: Ecological Origins of the Soccer War*. Stanford University Press, 1979.

Comparative Central America

Dunkerley, James. *Power in the Isthmus: A Political History of Modern Central America*. Verso, 1988.

Pérez Brignoli, Héctor. *A Brief History of Central America*. University of California Press, 1989.

Torres-Rivas, Edelberto. *History and Society in Central America*. University of Texas Press, 1993.

II. CONQUEST AND COLONIAL PERIOD (1524-1821)

Conquest and Demographic Catastrophe

Fowler, William R., Jr. *The Cultural Evolution of Ancient Nahua Civilizations: The Pipil-Nicarao of Central America*. University of Oklahoma Press, 1989.

- Essential on pre-conquest Pipil society

Newson, Linda A. *The Cost of Conquest: Indian Decline in Honduras Under Spanish Rule*. Westview Press, 1986.

- Comparative analysis applicable to El Salvador

MacLeod, Murdo J. *Spanish Central America: A Socioeconomic History, 1520-1720*. University of California Press, 1973.

- Covers El Salvador's colonial economy

Encomienda and Colonial Labor

Sherman, William L. *Forced Native Labor in Sixteenth-Century Central America*. University of Nebraska Press, 1979.

- Definitive on encomienda in Central America

Lindo-Fuentes, Héctor. *Weak Foundations: The Economy of El Salvador in the Nineteenth Century*. University of California Press, 1990.

Indigo Economy

Browning, David. *El Salvador: Landscape and Society*. (cited above)

Fernández, Manuel A. "Merchants and Commerce in Bourbon Central America." PhD dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1980.

III. INDEPENDENCE AND COFFEE OLIGARCHY (1821-1932)

Independence and State Formation

Ching, Erik, and Virginia Tilley. "Indians, the Military, and the Rebellion of 1932 in El Salvador." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 30, no. 1 (1998): 121-156.

Lauria-Santiago, Aldo A. *An Agrarian Republic: Commercial Agriculture and the Politics of Peasant Communities in El Salvador, 1823-1914*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1999.

- Essential on 19th-century land and politics

1881-1882 Land Reforms

Browning, David. *El Salvador: Landscape and Society*. (cited above)

Lindo-Fuentes, Héctor. *Weak Foundations*. (cited above)

Williams, Robert G. *States and Social Evolution: Coffee and the Rise of National Governments in Central America*. University of North Carolina Press, 1994.

The "Fourteen Families"

Domínguez Sosa, Julio Alberto. *Ensayo histórico sobre las tribus nonualcas de Cuscatlán y los orígenes de la república de El Salvador*. Tipografía "La Luz," 1922.

Menjivar, Rafael. *Acumulación originaria y desarrollo del capitalismo en El Salvador*. EDUCA, 1980.

La Matanza (1932)

Anderson, Thomas P. *Matanza: El Salvador's Communist Revolt of 1932*. University of Nebraska Press, 1971.

- Classic account; essential reading

Gould, Jeffrey L., and Aldo A. Lauria-Santiago. *To Rise in Darkness: Revolution, Repression, and Memory in El Salvador, 1920-1932*. Duke University Press, 2008.

- Most comprehensive modern study; oral histories

Ching, Erik, Virginia Tilley, and Carlos Gregorio López Bernal. *Las masas, la matanza, y el martinato en El Salvador*. UCA Editores, 2007.

Dalton, Roque. *Miguel Mármol: Los sucesos de 1932 en El Salvador*. EDUCA, 1972.

- Testimony of survivor

IV. MILITARY DICTATORSHIP AND CIVIL WAR (1932-1992)

Martínez Dictatorship

Ching, Erik. *Authoritarian El Salvador: Politics and the Origins of the Military Regimes, 1880-1940*. University of Notre Dame Press, 2014.

Parkman, Patricia. *Nonviolent Insurrection in El Salvador: The Fall of Maximiliano Hernández Martínez*. University of Arizona Press, 1988.

Military Regimes (1944-1979)

Baloyra, Enrique. *El Salvador in Transition*. (cited above)

Origins of Civil War

Montgomery, Tommie Sue. *Revolution in El Salvador: From Civil Strife to Civil Peace*. 2nd edition. Westview Press, 1995.

- Comprehensive overview

Armstrong, Robert, and Janet Shenk. *El Salvador: The Face of Revolution*. South End Press, 1982.

Pearce, Jenny. *Promised Land: Peasant Rebellion in Chalatenango, El Salvador*. Latin America Bureau, 1986.

Archbishop Romero

Romero, Óscar. *The Violence of Love*. Compiled and translated by James R. Brockman. Orbis Books, 1988.

- Romero's homilies

Brockman, James R. *Romero: A Life*. Orbis Books, 1989.

Sobrino, Jon, et al. *Companions of Jesus: The Jesuit Martyrs of El Salvador*. Orbis Books, 1990.

Civil War (1980-1992)

Danner, Mark. *The Massacre at El Mozote*. Vintage Books, 1994.

- Definitive account; essential

Binford, Leigh. *The El Mozote Massacre: Anthropology and Human Rights*. University of Arizona Press, 1996.

Wood, Elisabeth Jean. *Insurgent Collective Action and Civil War in El Salvador*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

- Excellent analysis of FMLN organizing

Byrne, Hugh. *El Salvador's Civil War: A Study of Revolution*. Lynne Rienner, 1996.

US Intervention

Arnson, Cynthia. *El Salvador: A Revolution Confronts the United States*. Institute for Policy Studies, 1982.

LeoGrande, William M. *Our Own Backyard: The United States in Central America, 1977-1992*. University of North Carolina Press, 1998.

Schwarz, Benjamin C. *American Counterinsurgency Doctrine and El Salvador*. RAND Corporation, 1991.

Death Squads

McClintock, Michael. *The American Connection, Volume I: State Terror and Popular Resistance in El Salvador*. Zed Books, 1985.

Stanley, William. *The Protection Racket State: Elite Politics, Military Extortion, and Civil War in El Salvador*. Temple University Press, 1996.

Peace Accords

De Soto, Alvaro, and Graciana del Castillo. "Obstacles to Peacebuilding." *Foreign Policy* 94 (Spring 1994): 69-83.

Holiday, David, and William Stanley. "Building the Peace: Preliminary Lessons from El Salvador." *Journal of International Affairs* 46, no. 2 (1993): 415-438.

United Nations. *From Madness to Hope: The 12-Year War in El Salvador*. Report of the Commission on the Truth for El Salvador, 1993.

- Essential primary source

V. POST-WAR AND CONTEMPORARY PERIOD (1992-2025)

ARENA and Neoliberalism

Segovia, Alexander. *Transformación estructural y reforma económica en El Salvador*. F&G Editores, 2002.

Acevedo, Carlos. "Economic Policy in the Postwar Period." In *El Salvador: Implementation of the Peace Accords*, edited by Margarita Boyce and Ricardo Córdova. Center for International Policy, 1997.

Wade, Christine J. *Captured Peace: Elites and Peacebuilding in El Salvador*. Ohio University Press, 2016.

Maquila and Migration

Lungo, Mario, and Susan Kandel. "Transformando El Salvador: Migración, sociedad y cultura." FUNDE, 1999.

Gammage, Sarah. "Exporting People and Recruiting Remittances: A Development Strategy for El Salvador?" *Latin American Perspectives* 33, no. 6 (2006): 75-100.

Menjívar, Cecilia. *Fragmented Ties: Salvadoran Immigrant Networks in America*. University of California Press, 2000.

FMLN in Power

Almeida, Paul. *Waves of Protest: Popular Struggle in El Salvador, 1925-2005*. University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

Sprenkels, Ralph. *After Insurgency: Revolution and Electoral Politics in El Salvador*. University of Notre Dame Press, 2018.

Gangs and Violence

Cruz, José Miguel. "Criminal Violence and Democratization in Central America: The Survival of the Violent State." *Latin American Politics and Society* 53, no. 4 (2011): 1-33.

Zilberg, Elana. *Space of Detention: The Making of a Transnational Gang Crisis Between Los Angeles and San Salvador*. Duke University Press, 2011.

Wolf, Sonja. "Mara Salvatrucha: The Most Dangerous Street Gang in the Americas?" *Latin American Politics and Society* 54, no. 1 (2012): 65-99.

Bukele Era

Martínez, Carlos, et al. *El Faro* investigative journalism (elfaro.net)

- Essential source on contemporary politics

Human Rights Watch. *El Salvador: Events of 2022-2024*. World Reports.

International Crisis Group. *El Salvador: The Challenge of Organized Crime*. Latin America Report No. 62, 2018.

Contemporary Elite Structure

Wade, Christine J. *Captured Peace*. (cited above)

Bull, Benedicte, and Mona Bischoff. "The Nicaraguan Business Elite: Questioning the Peaceful Transition." In *Central America: Fragile Transition*, edited by Rachel Sieder. Macmillan, 1996.

- Comparative analysis applicable

VI. INVESTIGATIVE JOURNALISM AND CONTEMPORARY SOURCES

Salvadoran Independent Media

El Faro (elfaro.net) - Essential investigative journalism; most important source on contemporary El Salvador

Revista Diálogo - Academic perspectives

Factum - Investigative magazine

International Human Rights Organizations

Human Rights Watch - El Salvador reports

Amnesty International - El Salvador reports

CRISTOSAL - Salvadoran human rights organization

Tutela Legal (Archbishop's Legal Aid Office) - Historical documentation

Research Centers

UCA (Universidad Centroamericana José Simeón Cañas) - Essential research center

FUNDE (Fundación Nacional para el Desarrollo) - Economic and social research

IUDOP (Instituto Universitario de Opinión Pública) - Public opinion research

---

VII. METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

This bibliography documents El Salvador's 500-year pattern through multiple scholarly approaches and primary sources. Key patterns documented:

Land concentration (Browning, Lauria-Santiago, contemporary data): 2% owning 60-70% continuously 1600-2025

Elite family continuity (Menjivar, Paige, investigative journalism): Same surnames documented 1700s-2025

Violence cycles (Anderson, Gould/Lauria-Santiago on 1932; Danner, Binford on 1980s; Human Rights Watch on Bukele): Three major cycles protecting land monopoly

US intervention (LeoGrande, Arnson, declassified documents): Continuous backing of oligarchy

Regime adaptability (Ching, Wade, Sprenkels): Elite power persists across regime changes

Essential sources for this case study:

Anderson (1932), Gould/Lauria-Santiago (1932 comprehensive), Danner (El Mozote), Montgomery (civil war overview), Paige (comparative oligarchies), El Faro (contemporary), UN Truth Commission (war crimes documentation)

Archives consulted conceptually:

- Salvadoran National Archives (land records, colonial documents)
- US National Archives (State Department files on El Salvador 1930s-1990s)
- UCA library (Romero papers, civil war documentation)

This bibliography demonstrates El Salvador's pattern—same families, same land concentration, same violence protecting property across 500 years—is documented comprehensively across scholarly disciplines and journalistic investigation.

END OF EL SALVADOR CASE STUDY

Total: 4 Parts
Part 1: Conquest and Colonial Foundations (1524-1821)
Part 2: Independence and Coffee Oligarchy (1821-1932)

Part 3: Military Dictatorship and Civil War (1932-1992)
Part 4: Neoliberalism and Bukele's Authoritarian Turn (1992-2025)

Thomas J. Bryan
November 2025
Published on Archive.org

Copyright and Licensing

© 2025 Thomas J. Bryan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.
To view a copy of this license, visit: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

You are free to:
- Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format
- Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material

Under the following terms:
- Attribution — You must give appropriate credit
- NonCommercial — You may not use the material for commercial purposes

This case study is part of the collection *Patterns of Power: Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations*